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COMPARATIVE GRAMMAR.

PRONOUNS.
FIRST AND SECOND PERSONS.

326. In these pronouns the genders are not distinguished in any of the Indo-European languages; and all the sister dialects agree with one another surprisingly in this point, that the nominative singular first person is from a different base from that from which the oblique cases come. It is, Sanskrit अहम् aham, Zend 𐙃𐙂𐙃 azēm, Greek ἑγώ, Latin ego, Gothic ik, Lithuanian asz, Old Sclavonic az. The am of अहम् aham is termination, as in twam, "thou," ayam, "this," and swayam, "self;" and as in the plural, vayam, "we," yāyam, "ye." The Ἀeolic ἑγόν answers better than ἑγώ to aham; but I would prefer ἑγόν, in order to explain the lengthening of the vowel in ἑγό as a compensation for the loss of the nasal. The abbreviated ἑγό, may, however, have reacted on the more complete ἑγόν, and imparted to it the length of its vowel. In the other European languages, except the Latin, the entire termination has disappeared, as is also the case in Greek and Latin in ἐσ, το, tu, contrasted with the Sanskrit-Zend twam (from tu-am), ἑγό τό. To the latter, however, answers the Bæot. τόγυν, and the η of the Doric and Lacon. τόνη, τονύη, is, perhaps, an unorganic addition, as, in Gothic, the a in [G. Ed. p. 468.] pronominal accusatives (tha-na for than, from tham, (§. 149.), if not, νη must be regarded as an annexed particle. The oblique cases, in Sanskrit, have in the first person ma, and in the second twa, as theme, which is lengthened, however, in some cases, by the admixture of an i (compare §. 158.); hence mē, twē. On the other hand, twa, in the
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dative, abbreviates itself to *tu (tu-bhyum), from which, also, the nominative *tw-am: in the genitive *tav-a the *u of *tu receives the Guna, or the *a of *twa is transposed. To the base *ma answers the Greek MO, from which come the genitive *µoν, and dative *µοι. The *ε of *EMO rests on the prevailing disposition of the Greek to prefix a vowel to forms beginning with a consonant, as in δνοµα, ὁδούς, ὅφρυς, ἐλαχύς, contrasted with nāma, danta-s, bhrā-s, lughu-s, "light." The o of MO, *EMO is interchanged with *ε (see §. 3.): hence ἐµεῖο, ἐµέθεν for ἐµοῖο, ἐµό-θεν (compare πόθεν, ἄλλο-θεν, &c.); ἐµέο for ἐµόο;* ἐµεῖ, µεῦ for ἐµοῖ, µοῦ. In the ἈEolic-Doric forms ἐµεῖς, ἐµοῖς, as in τεῦς, τεοῦς, the Σ is a later addition, introduced by the necessity for a Σ as a genitive character, after the old genitive Σ—which, according to §. 189., in the o declension did not stand at the end but in the middle—had been long lost. Compare, in this respect, the regained genitive sibilants in New German forms like Herzens (p. 167 G. Ed.). In the uninflected accusative µέ, ἐµέ, the final *ε for o, which latter might have been expected, is to be regarded as similar to the ε of the vocative λύκε in §. 201. As to the dispensing with the accusative nasal, however, it is important to remark, that, in Sanskrit, for µάµ, "me," and µώµ, "thee," we also find µά, µώµ, without the case-sign; and the rejection of the µ has, [G. Ed. p. 469.] perhaps, next given occasion to the lengthening of the a; so that here that would hold good with regard to µάµ and µώµ that was conjectured above of ἐγὼν for ἐγόν.† The Latin supports in like manner, by its accusatives µέ and τέ, the ancient loss of the inflexion.

* The form λυκοῖο would have, according to the usual rules of contraction, to be compared with λυκοῦ, after loss of the *ε through an intervening λυκο.† The reason of the lengthening might also be looked for in the words being monosyllabic; but this applies to the ablatives *µατ, *twat.
327. The theme of the second person *twa* divides itself in Greek, after the vowel or semi-vowel has been lost, into the forms *ΣΥ* and *ΣΟ*, for *ΣFO*, and the *ο* is exchanged with *ε*, as in the first person, *σείο*, *σέθεν*, &c. II. VIII. 37 the *ε* of *τεύο*—*τεύ-(σ)*ο*—stands, as it appears, as a melting of the *ι*, or thinning of the *υ* (as τιχης-ώς for πτίχυ-ος); and the to-be-presupposed *τυσιο* or *τυσιο* would correspond excellently to the Zend *thwa-hya*, to which a Sanskrit *twa-sya* would answer, in case *thwahyā*, which formerly appeared to me to be an instrumental, is really a genitive, as, according to p. 280, Rem. 3., can scarcely be doubted. The Gothic has weakened the *α* of the base *ma* to *i*, and contracted the termination *να* of the 2d person to *u*; hence *MI, THU*, dative *mi-s, thu-s*, accusative *mi-k, thu-k*. The genitive is, in Sanskrit, in departure from all other genitives, *mama, tava*. The former appears to have arisen by reduplication; the Zend, however, substitutes for it *mama*; and, in the Gothic, *na* has assumed so much the character of an inflexion, that it has made its way also into the 2d person and the 3d person, which is void of gender; *mei-na, thei-na, sei-na*. The *ina* I regard as an abbreviation of *thvei-na*, as I imagine *sei-na* to come from *svei-na*, for *thuna* must have sprung from *THU*. As, however, *ν ma* has, in Gothic, become *MI*, and from this has been formed, by lengthening it, *MEI*; so might also *ν tva* become *THI'I* and *THI'EI*. According to this, the genitive [G. Ed. p. 470.] *theina*—as the abbreviation of *thveina*—in respect to its base, has the same relation to *thu*, that, in Greek, *σού* (from *σFeύ*) has to *σύ*, or that *τεύ* (from *τFeύ*) has to *τύ*.

328. In Latin, as in Gothic, the *α* of the Indian *ma* has been weakened to *i*, and this, in a measure, has changed the declension of the pronoun from the second, which, according to §. 116., was to have been expected, into the third: dative *mi-hi* for *मद्र* ma-*hyam* (§. 215.); accusative *me* for *mem* (as *hoste-m* from *HOSTI*), not *mu* for *mum*; ablativa *me*
from *med, not *mo from *mod = Sanskrit सति मति. The genitive mei is based, according to §. 200., on the locative सति may-i (euphonic for me-i), and belongs, therefore, to the lengthened theme स. mei. In the second person, according to the analogy of mei, the form त्रि might have been expected from त्रित्रित्रि, and may originally have existed, but in the actual condition of the language is impossible, for *v cannot consist with a preceding consonant, but in this position is either resolved into u, and at times, indeed, with the sacrifice of the vowel following, as in *sud-o, answering to स्वति *swid, “to sweat”; or has itself disappeared, as in *canis, answering to स्वन, “a dog;” *sonus for *svunus, answering to स्वानस, “a tone”;* or has dislodged the preceding consonant, as above (p. 424), in *bis, as a hardening of *vis, from *dvis. We should hence have to expect for *tui, together with some other forms, also *tei (for *tei), as, too, *ti-bi may be taken to be an abbreviation of *tvi-bi: although the dative in Sanskrit is *tu-bhyan, and the transition from *u to *i in Latin is not unusual (fourth declension *i-bus for *u-bus), still the Sanskrit contraction of *twa-bhyan to *tu-bhyan is scarcely of so old a date

[G. Ed. p. 471.] as to serve for a point of departure for the Latin *ti-bi; and I therefore prefer considering *tibi, *sibi, as abbreviations of *twi-bi, *swi-bi, rather than as corruptions of *tu-bi, *su-bi.

329. In Sanskrit, मा, ते, exist as co-forms for the genitive and dative (मुन, तव, महयम, तुब्धयम): ते, however, is clearly an abbreviation of त्रे, and I have since found this opinion, which I have expressed before, supported by Rosen’s Veda-specimen (p. 26), and by the Zend. * The latter gives ाौः त्रवौः for the Vedic त्वौ; but at the same time, also, the abbreviated forms ाौ त्विः and ाौ ते; by which, as it were, the way of corruption is pointed out to

* The Greek φωνή is, probably, an analogous word, and would, accordingly, stand for σφωνή.
the Latin *ti-bi* and Gothic *thei-na.* Although, according to §. 326., नें *mê* and नें *twê* lie at the bottom of several cases as theme, still, perhaps, these forms, together with the abbreviated *tê*, where they appear as genitives or datives, are not to be regarded as naked bases, as it is contrary to the genius of the language to introduce a theme, as such, into speech;* but they may be explained as locatives, according to the principle of the common *a* bases (§. 196.), especially as, in Sanskrit, the locative very frequently supplies the place of the dative, and the dative relation is expressed by the genitive even more commonly than by the dative itself. But if नें *mê* and नें *tê*, नें *twê*, and the corresponding Zend forms, are really locatives, they are then, according to §. 196., identical with the Greek datives *µοί*, *σοί*, or *τοί*, which, however, must be compared with the actual locatives मयि, तवयि, *by casting out the semi-vowel, if नें *mê* and नें *tê* are to pass as uninflected themes, extended only mechanically.

330. The genitives मम *mama*, मुंष मुना, [G. Ed. p. 472.] and *tava*, serve the Lithuanian, and, with the exception of the ablative and genitive, also the Old Sclavonic, as the groundwork for the declension of the oblique singular cases. They are recognised with a weakening of the final *a* to *i* most distinctly in the Lithuanian instrumental and locative *manimî*, *manîye*, *tawimû*, *tawiyî*. The genitive, dative, and accusative are anomalous—*maneîs*, *taveîs*, *man*, *taw*, *maneî*, *taweî*,—but have, in like manner, proceeded from the old genitive. In Old Sclavonic, the accusative *nya*, *tya*, still remains upon the old footing, and, according to §. 255. a. p. 310., answers to मा *md*, "me," ना *twâ*, "thee," with loss of the *v* in the second person. The genitive *mene*, "of me," answers exactly to the Zend

* The case is different when a word, by rubbing off the termination, sinks back again into the condition of a theme: besides, only neuters, in the nominative, accusative, and vocative singular, exhibit the pure theme.
mana (see §. 225. a.) and tebc, “of thee,” to the Indo-Zend tava. Considered from a Slavonic point of view, however, MEN, TEB, must be regarded as themes, and e for es as the common genitive termination (§. 269.). MNO, TEBO, and TOBO, clearly lie as themes at the bottom of the dative and locative mnye, tbye.

331. The plural in the pronoun of the first person is, in most of the Indo-European languages, distinct in base from the singular. I have already elsewhere endeavoured to explain this* on the ground that “I” is properly incapable of a plural, for there is but one “I,” and the notion “we” comprehends “me” and an indefinite number of other individuals, each of which may even belong to a different species; while by leones a plurality of individuals is represented, of which each is a lion. And the case is similar with the plurals of all other substantives, adjectives, and pronouns; for “they” is a multiplying of “he,” and “ye” may at least be rather regarded as the plural of “thou,” than “we” as the plural of “I.”

[G. Ed. p. 473.] Where, however, the idea “we” is expressed by the plural of “I,” it there happens on account of the preponderating feeling of our own personality, in which the “not I” is drowned, and is left unnoticed, or is supplied by the custom of the language. Hence one might seek to compare the Sanskrit nominative वायम vayam (from vē + am) by the frequent interchange of m and v (§. 63.) with the lengthened singular base नम me (p. 468 G. ed.), an interchange which must, however, be very old, since the German, scarcely by accident, partakes in it, and which may be favoured by the circumstance that there exists actually an internal motive for a difference in the base syllable.

332. In the Vêdas we find a-smē also for vayam; and this asmē is, according to §. 228., formed from the theme asma, from which also, in the common Sanskrit, all the oblique

* Hist. Phil. Trans. of the Ac. of Lit. for the year 1824. p. 134.
oases proceed, and to which the Greek allies itself, commencing even with the nominative; for the most genuine Æolic form ἄμμες stands, by assimilation, for ἄσμες (see §. 170.), as ἐμι from ἐσμὶ. Sanskrit asmi, "I am." For ἄμμες, however, ἄμµοι ought to be the corresponding word to the Vedic asmē; as the theme asma, according to §. 116., would, in the Greek, sound ΑΣΜΟ: however, by dropping the final vowel, the Greek form has wandered into the department of another declension. The same is the case with ὑμες, answering to the Vedic yushmē (euphonic for yusmē). On the other hand, ἦµες, ἦµες, pre-suppose a theme ἩΜΙ, ὓΜΙ, the ἰ of which is to be taken as a weakening of the Indian a of asma, yushma; as, in Gothic, UNSA, IZV (§. 167.), together with UNSA, IZVA. The genitives ἄµµε-ων, ὑµµε-ων, also—for ἄµµι-ων, ὑµµι-ων, and in the common language ἦµων, ὑµων—shew that they are deduced from bases in ω: just so the datives ἦµιν, ὑµιν, for ἦµι-ν, ὑµι-ν, with ν for the Indian termination ῥυαµ in asmabhyaµ, yushmabhyaµ (§. 222.). The accusatives ἦµας, ὑµας, are contractions of an unusual kind [G. Ed. p. 474.] from ἦµ-ας, ὑµ-ας, for which ἦµις, ὑµις, or ἦµεις, ὑµεις, might be expected. The Æolic forms ἄµµε, ὑµµε, are uninflected, as in the singular µε, σε; and in case they are, in respect to their termination, older than ἦµας, ὑµας, they admit of derivation direct from the Sanskrit asmān, yushmān (for asma-ns, yushma-ns, §. 236.), by abrasion of the case suffix, without intervention of a theme ἩΜΜΙ, ὓΜΜΙ.

333. In asmē, ἄµµες, the simple vowel a is the characteristic element of the first person, for the rest of the word occurs also in the second person—γνωµένες yushmē, ὑµµες. If, then, this a is also connected with the singular base ma, it would be requisite to assume an aphæresis of the m, which, however, would appear to be very old, from the coincidence of the Sanskrit, Zend, &c. with the Greek and German; for the Gothic base UNSA or UNSI has been regarded by us, in §. 166., as a transposition of asma—Pâli and Prâkrit amha; the u for a is
to be explained by the influence of the transposed nasal (§ 66.). But if the \( a \) of अस्म asma is an abbreviation of \( ma \), (in the opposite case it would be identical with the demonstrative base \( a \)), and if, therefore, in this plural base, the "I" is actually formally expressed, I would then place great stress on the fact, that, in Sanskrit and Greek, the appended pronoun sma, or that which it has become in Greek, in the pronouns of the 1st and 2d person only occurs in the plural. For as sma, which occurs also isolated,* can be nothing else than a pronoun of the third person,† so would

\[ \text{G. Ed. p. 475.} \]  
\[ a\text{-smē} \], as a copulative compound (Gramm. Crit. § 658.), signify "I" and "they"; but yushmē, "thou" and "they"; so that the singular "I" and "thou" would be expressed by \( a \) and \( yu \); the plural "they" by \( smē \); and this would be the most natural as well as the clearest and most perfect designation of the compound ideas "we" and "ye." The ingress of the appended pronoun into the singular of the first and second persons, in Zend, Pāli, Prākṛit, and German (§ 174.), must, then, be ascribed to an abuse of later introduction. In the pronouns of the third person, however, the analogy of which may have had an effect on the abuse cited in the declension of the two first persons in the singular, the union of two, nay, even of three pronouns of the same person into one whole is extraordinarily frequent, and originally, it seems, betokened only increase of emphasis.

334. The syllable य \( yu \) of युष्मे yushmē, "ye," is pro-

* Either with imperceptible meaning, or referring the action of the present to the further side of the past.

† Pott may be right in explaining (Berl. Ann. 1833. Vol. I. p. 324) sma from sama, "like." I should, however, then hold "the same" to be the ancient meaning of sama, and the idea of similarity as a derived one; and also no longer explain sama, as in my Glossary, from \( mē \), "to measure," but regard it as the combination of the pronominal bases \( sa \) and \( ma \) (compare ima, "this," from \( i + ma \)).
bably a softening of *tu*, which extends itself also to the dual, to which *yuva* serves as the theme.* The Greek *σφῶ* (*σφωϊ*), however, has been retained more complete, and represents the Sanskrit singular base *twa*, with σ for *t*, and ϕ for *v*. In the latter respect, compare also *σφεις* and *σφός* with the Sanskrit *swayam*, "self," and *s va-s*, "s uus," regarding which hereafter.† The Prākṛt and Pāli, and several other Indian dialects. [G. Ed. p. 476.] have retained the *t* in the plural unaltered, or restored; hence, Pāli-Prākṛt तुष्ण *tumhē* for *tusmē*. In Gothic, however, by rejecting the *u*, and exchanging the *m* for *v*, *yu-sama* has become *I-ZTA*, and by weakening the *u* to *i*, *I-ZTI* (§. 167.). The Lithuanian gives *YU* as the theme of the majority of cases in the dual and plural, and in the first person *MU* to which, however, the nominative *mēs* "we" does not correspond. The appended pronoun च *sma* has been distinctly retained only in the genitive dual and locative plural—although it is originally foreign to the dual,—but, in the former case, to which the numeral is annexed, the *s*, and in the latter case the *m*, has fallen out; hence *mu-mū dumēyū*, "of us two"; *yu-mū dumēyū*, "of you two"‡; *mu-sūse*, "in us"; *yusūse* "in you."

* From *yu* + *a*, with change of the *u* into *uv*, according to a universal euphonic law (Gramm. Crit. §. 51.).

† As I formerly took the σ, in forms like *αχερφι* (see §. 218.), for a euphonic addition, I thought also (Hist. Phil. Trans. of the Ac. of Lit. for the year 1825. p. 196) that I might explain *σφω*, answering to the Latin *vos* and Sanskrit *vam*, *vas*, as corrupted by prefixing a σ allied to the ϕ. This opinion, however, stands in no further need of support, from the information which I have since then gained regarding the σ of forms in *σφι*; and I accede so much the more willingly to the abovementioned opinion, which was first expressed by Max. Schmidt (De Pron, Gr. et Lat., p. 8.)

‡ According to Mielcke, also *mama dumēyū* and *yumma dumēyū*, the latter with doubled *m*; the first of which is to be explained by assimilation of the *s*, as in the *Æolic*, *EMPLAS*. 
335. It is, however, also very probable that the s in the Lithuanian nominative mės, “we,” yūs, “ye,” as well as the s of the Gothic veis, yus, is not the sign of the nominative, as it appears to be in the actual condition of the language, but an abbreviation of the syllable smu. This conjecture is raised almost to certainty by the Zend, in which, together with the ṝuṣəm yūshēm (see §. 59.), which rests on the Sanskrit yūṣm yūyam (from yū + am, with euphonic y, §. 43.), ṝuṣ also occurs; the s of which is represented by Burnouf (Yasna, Notes, p. 121), in which he is clearly right, as identical with the Sanskrit ṁ of yūṣmat (ablative, and, in the beginning of compounds, representing the theme, see p. 112 G. ed.).

[G. Ed. p. 477.] Wherefore ṝuṣ, is an abbreviation of the Vedic ṣuṣmē; and the s can in nowise pass for the sign of the nominative; as from a theme yu, according to the usual declension in the nominative and vocative plural, must come either yavd or yvō. According to the pronominal declension, however, we have already seen ṝuṣəm yūshēm developed from the Sanskrit yūṣm yūyam. In Lithuanian, mės, if s were the sign of case, would stand completely isolated as the masculine plural nominative*; and as to the German, that language has, from the earliest period, lost the sign of the case in the nominative plural; while the r of wir, ihr, which corresponds to the Gothic s of veis, yus, has remained to this day, which, with other weighty reasons, awards to this r likewise a destination other than that of denoting the relation of case.

336. According to the principle of the Zend-Lithuanian-Gothic yūs, yus, I explain also the Sanskrit ṃ, ʊs, ṹ, ṃas, which are used as co-forms in the accusative, dative, and

* Although in this pronoun there is no obvious distinction of gender, still the Sanskrit declension-forms, viz. asmē, asmān, are masculine.
genitive of the two first persons; the * of which, however, could not find any legitimate place in such different cases, if, by its origin, it was destined to denote a case-connection. In the same way, however, that the Zend yâs is the abbreviation of yûsmê, so may तस् nas and वस् vas be deduced in the accusative, from nasmân, vasmân, and in the dative and genitive, from nasmabhûyan, nasmdkam, vasmabhûyan, vasmâkam; and the * therefore, suits all the three cases, exactly because it expresses none of them. There remain, after the dissolution of the rest of the appended pronoun, ma and va, as the chief elements of personal definition, from which have proceeded the dual secondary forms niu and vâm (for vânu). [G. Ed. p. 478.]

The n of na, however, is a weakening of the m, the high antiquity of which may be traced from the coincidence with the Greek, Latin, and Slavonic: but va is an abbreviation of two, as, viûsati, "twenty," from dviûsati.

337. The bases न ma, ब va, would lead us to expect in Latin NU, VIU (nō, vo, §. 116.), as themes; ni, vi, as plural nominatives; and nos, vos, as accusatives. The circumstance, however, that nos, vos, are found already in the nominative, and that the final s is retained also in the possessives nos-ter, ves-ter (for vos-ter), must cause the os of nos, vos, in the accusative, to appear to us in an entirely different light from that of lupos; and the explanation which we have given of the s of the indisputably kindred Sanskrit forms तस् na-s, वस् va-s, must therefore extend also to that of no-s, ro-s, objectionable as it may appear from the point of view of the self-restricted Latin Grammar, when we seek in nos and vos a remnant of the appended pronoun sma, treated of in §. 166. &c., which we also recognise robbed of its s* in the appended syllable met (egomê, memet, tumet, nosmet, &c.)

* Comp. memor for mesmor with Sanskrit smar; so, too, Pott (l.c. explains the Latin met.
which refers itself most closely to the Sanskrit plural ablative a-smat, yu-shmat, which is also employed by the language instead of the theme for all cases and numbers (§. 112.), on which account the like free use of the Latin met cannot appear surprising. Moreover, I have elsewhere endeavoured to explain the Latin immo by assimilation from i-smo, and so to apportion the first part to the demonstrative base i, and the last to our sma.

338. We now turn to the Old Scavonic, where nas* and vas as genitive and locative, are completely identical

[G. Ed. p. 479.] with the नस nas and वस vas of Sanskrit, which in that language are, indeed, excluded from the locative, but still hold the place of genitives. The monosyllabic nature of these forms has, in Scavonic, protected the old a as well as the final s (§. 255. a. l.); but here, also, this s cannot be looked upon as a case-character, as, without exception, the terminations सम sâm and सु su have, in Old Scavonic, become ch (p. 355, Note 6). The concurrent disinclination of so many languages to consider the s, in the common forms under discussion, as a sign of case, strengthens the evidence for each single individual language. As to the Sanskrit, however, applying in the dual the forms nâu, vâm (for vâu, p. 472, Note 1), in cases to which dû does not belong as the inflexion, in this point it is not supported by any of the European sister languages: we might still, however, admit the conjecture, that here, also, the dû is not a case-termination, but is derived from a different origin, and, in fact, to be so regarded, as that nâu, vâu (corrupted to vâm) are extensions of the plural nas, vas, by lengthening the a, and by resolving the s to u, according to the analogy of §. 206. For if a case termination âs has become छौ dû—and in Zend every final âs, without distinction, has become ao—it

* But see §. 788, Note 1, p. 1046.
cannot be surprising that nās, also, has become nāu; and then in nāu a dual case termination is just as little contained as in nas a plural. The sensual dual, however, loves broader forms than the plural (compare §. 206.); and to this inclination the lengthening of the a of nas, vas, may be ascribed. But nāu may, however—and this I much prefer—be regarded as a copulative compound from nā-s; so that it would stand in the accusative for nā-smāu, in the genitive for nā-smayōs, according to the principle of the Vēdic pitarā-māturāu,* "father and mother," literally, "two fathers, two mothers." [G. Ed. p. 480.]

According to this, nāu would properly mean, as accusative, "me and him," as above (§. 333.) asmē, for masmē, "I and they"; and vām, for vāu—Zend Ᾱo vāo—would denote as accusative, "thee and him." According to this principle of copulative composition we may probably view, also, ā-vām, (for ā-vāu), "we two"; so that, with a more retiring designation of the third person, it would literally mean "he and I"; for a is a demonstrative base, which is here lengthened to the dual form ā (§. 208.), and vām (genitive and locative vayōs) answers, in respect to its base, to vayam, "we," (p. 462.).†

339. At the base of the two first persons of the Greek dual lie ΝΩ, ΣΦΩ, as themes, which support the opinion, that in नी nāu, वाम vām (for vāu), to which they bear the same relation that ὀκτω does to αἰθω, the āu is not a case termination. For if ΝΩ, ΣΦΩ were the themes in Greek, the genitive and dative would necessarily be νοω, σφων, as it would be unnatural that the long vowel, which, in the nominative and accusative, would be explicable according to

* See pp. 228, 229, and shorter Sanskrit Grammar, §. 589. Rem.
† I formerly thought (l.c. §. 274.) the ā of āvām might be regarded as a strengthening prefix, as in the middle of the 2nd and 3rd dual person. But the above view answers better to the analysis which was given, §. 333., of the plural.
the analogy of λύκω, from ΛΥΚΟ, should be retained before the termination ν. It would, it seems, be rightly assumed, that in the nominative and accusative, νῶι, σφωϊ, are the original forms, and νά, σφάω (for νο, σφω), abbreviations of them. From νῶι, σφωϊ, spring, also, the possessives νῶτέρος, σφωτέρος. But how stands it with the very isolated Greek dual forms νῶι, σφωϊ? Max. Schmidt (l. c. p. 94) supposes therein a remnant of the Sanskrit neuter dual termination ἰ (§. 212.). It would not be necessary, if this be so, to assume that in νῶι, σφωϊ, a masculine and neuter dual termination are united,

[G. Ed. p. 481.] as ΝΩ and ΣΦΩ have already been made to pass as themes, from which νῶι, σφωϊ, would be very satisfactorily explained by the addition of a single termination. Observe, however, that the pronouns of the first and second persons do not originally distinguish any genders, and occur in Sanskrit only with masculine terminations; that therefore a remnant of the lost neuter termination is less to be expected in these very pronouns in Greek than in any other word whatever. Hence I prefer recognising in the ἰ of νῶι, σφωϊ, a weakening of the dual-ending ἰ, which originally pertained to the masculine and feminine, and which, in the common declension, has become ἵ (§. 209.). According to this, the ἰ has the same relation to this ἵ and the Zend ᾽a that the ᾿Εοlic πίσαρες has to τέσσαρες and όμικρόνιον chathwάρι. This opinion finds particular support from the fact that νῶι actually occurs for νῶι, as in the third person σφωτε, not σφωτε; and in the second person, also, the Grammarians assume σφωε together with σφωτε (Buttmann Lex. I. 52).

340. We give here a connected general view of the declension of the pronouns of the two first persons, with the remark that the compared languages do not everywhere agree with one another in regard of inflexion. We select from the Greek, where it is desirable for the sake of comparison, the dialectic forms which come nearest to the Sanskrit or the Zend.
**SINGULAR.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sanskrit</th>
<th>Zend</th>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>Latin</th>
<th>Gothic</th>
<th>Lith.</th>
<th>Old Sclav</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>aham, azem,</td>
<td>ēyōn, ego, ik, asz, az</td>
<td>taw, tum,</td>
<td>tuw, tu, thu, t, ty.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mām, mā, manim, mā,</td>
<td>mē, mē, mē,</td>
<td>mām, mya.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tawam, thwaim, thwā, rē, t, thuk,</td>
<td>tawin tyā.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mayā,</td>
<td>manim, mawā.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mahayam,</td>
<td>ēmu, mihi, mis,</td>
<td>man, muye, mi.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mē, mē, mē,</td>
<td>meu,</td>
<td>mē, meina, meaneus, mene.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tubhayam,</td>
<td>tē,</td>
<td>te(d),</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thwē, tē, thwōi, tē, tōi,</td>
<td>rot,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mat,</td>
<td>mē(d),</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>matta,</td>
<td>eμēθεν</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>twat, thwat,</td>
<td>te(d),</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>twattas,</td>
<td>σιθεν</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mana, mana,</td>
<td>meu, mei, meina, maneus, mene.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mē, mē, mē,</td>
<td>mei,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tara, tara,</td>
<td>reu, tui, theina, tuavis, tebi.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>twē, tē, thwēi, tē, tōi</td>
<td>tui,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mayi,</td>
<td>mei,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>twayi, thvahā.</td>
<td>tawin tyā.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 See §§. 175. 174. And as regards the k and that of si-k, "self," see §. 814. p. 1104. Note †. In Old Sclav. we should read for mya, tyā, according to §. 785. Rem. and (2), mān, tān. 2 See §. 222. 3 See §. 174. 4 See §. 329. 5 At the base of the forms matta, twattas, lies the proper ablative mat, twat, as theme (compare Gramm. Crit. §. 289.), to which has been added the suffix taš, which signifies the same as the ablative termination t, and is also formally connected with it, and to which the Greek θεν corresponds. 6 See §. 200. 7 See §. 174.

**DUAL.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sanskrit</th>
<th>Zend</th>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>Gothic</th>
<th>Lith</th>
<th>Old Sclav</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>dvām, 1</td>
<td>vōi,</td>
<td>vit,</td>
<td>mudi,</td>
<td>m. va, f. vye.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yuvām, 1</td>
<td>σφων,</td>
<td>ydu,</td>
<td>m. va, f. vye 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dvām, 1</td>
<td>vōi 2</td>
<td>ugkis,</td>
<td>m. va, f. vye 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nām,</td>
<td>vōi 2</td>
<td>m. va, f. vye 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yuvām, 1</td>
<td>ydu,</td>
<td>m. va, f. vye 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vām, 1</td>
<td>σφων,</td>
<td>m. va, f. vye 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I regard the termination ám as a hardening of the common dual termination áu (before vowels áv); and I would crave attention to the frequent interchange of v and m (§. 63., compare p. 114). This hardening has not, in the 1st person, extended into the secondary form; and in the 2d person the Zend váo speaks for an older Sanskrit form vin for vim. The Zend form váo occurs in the 34th chapter of the Izeshne, and appears, also, to stand as nominative. However, the Zend is not wanting in an analogous form to the Sanskrit dual base yava; for that which Anquetil, in his Glossary, writes ieovákm, and renders by vous deux, ought probably to be yavákm, and is clearly an analogous dual genitive (p. 473 Rem.) to the plural gen. yismákm, which Anquetil likewise considers as nominative. 

1 See §. 330. 2 See §. 339. 3 The t clearly belongs to the number two (theme TWA), which, in Lithuanian, is retained through all the cases. 4 Feminine mudwé. 5 The distinction of the genders [G. Ed. p. 484.] has been introduced, contrary to the original principle, through the analogy of the common dual (see §. 273.), as the Old Slavonic, too, in the dual personal terminations, which, in Sanskrit, Zend, and Greek, mark the genders just as little as the other numbers distinguishes the feminine from the masculine by the termination ye (= e, §. 155. e.). 6 Feminine yudwi. 7 See §. 169. 8 The comparison with the Sanskrit principal form regards the case termination; that with the secondary form the theme.
PRONOUNS.

PLURAL.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sanskrit</th>
<th>Zend</th>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>Latin</th>
<th>Gothic</th>
<th>Lith.</th>
<th>Old Sclav.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>vegam, veām, ...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>asmā,1</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yāgam, yūshēm</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yus, yus,</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>asmān, ...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>us, ...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yus, ...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>asmabhīs, ...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>nobis, ...</td>
<td>munis, nami</td>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yusmahbhīs, ...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>robis, ...</td>
<td>yunis, vam.</td>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>asmabhīgam, ...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>munus, nam.</td>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yus, ...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>robis, ...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yusmahbhīgam yūsmacīhya, ...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>izvis,</td>
<td>yunus, vam.</td>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vam, ...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>asmāt, ...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>nobis</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yusmat, ...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>robis</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>asmākam,6 ahmākēm, ...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>unsara, mūsū,</td>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nas, ...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>nostri, ...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yusmahkam,6 yūsmākēm, ...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>izvara, yūsū,</td>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vam, ...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 See §. 332. 2 See §. 170. 3 See §. 337. 4 See §. 325. 5 See §. 174.

[G. Ed. p. 485.] "Remark.—Max Schmidt (l. c. pp. 9, 10) rightly takes the forms asmākam, yusmahkam, for possessives; and Rosen has since confirmed this view (Journal of Education, July—Oct. 1834, p. 348) by the Vēda dialect yūsmaḥkābhīr, ātībhis, 'vestris auxiliis'). We must therefore regard asmākam, yusmahkam, as singular neuters, which are, as it were, petrified, and have thus lost the power of being governed according to the gender, number, and case of their substantive. In the two first respects they may be compared with numeral expressions (§. 318.) like pancha, 'five,' which, in the Greek tēn'te and Latin quinque, has become completely indeclinable, and therefore exactly like asmākam, yusmahkam, Zend ahmākēm, yūsmākēm and the
dual form mentioned at p. 472, Note 1, yarākān. It is clear that the Latin forms, also, nostri, nostrum, vestri, vestrum, belong to the possessive; and for nostrum, vestrum, are used also nostrorum, vestrorum (Schmidt, p. 10). As, then, unsara, izvara, stand altogether isolated in Gothic as genitives, it is, in my opinion, much more natural to derive them from the possessive bases of the same sound which form, in the nominative singular masculine, unsar, izvar (see p. 390 G. ed. Note)—than, on the contrary, to deduce the possessives from the unexplained genitives of the personal pronoun, so that they would be without any derivative suffix whatever, which is opposed to the common laws for the derivation of words. I most prefer regarding unsara, izvara, and the analogous dual forms, as singular and dual neuters, like the Sanskrit asmākam, yuvhnikam, and with an antiquated retention of the a of the base, which in druor for draura (§. 153.) has disappeared. Ought, also, the singular genitives to be viewed in this light? for meina, theina, seina, are possessive bases as well as the genitives of the personal pronouns; and if the former had proceeded from the latter, the addition of a suffix might have been expected. Perhaps even in Sanskrit the expressions māmā, tava, which are far removed from all the forms of genitives, are originally possessives, from which, after they were no longer recognised as such, sprang the secondary forms māmak, tāvaka, as bālaka comes, without alteration of meaning, from bālu, 'a boy.' Observe, also, the surprising accordance between the Greek possessive base τεό, from τεότο, and the Sanskrit genitive tava. The form σό-ς, however, has scarcely proceeded from σοῦ, but from the more entire τεό-ς, by syncope and exchange of the τ with σ. In regard to the replacing of the genitive of pronouns without gender by the corresponding possessives, it deserves further to be remarked,

[G. Ed. p. 486.] that, in Hindūstānī, the forms, which are represented in both numbers of all declinable words as genitives, are shewn to be unmistakeable possessives,
by being governed by the gender of the following substantive. The pronouns of the first and second person have in the masculine ṛā, in the feminine ṛī, as the possessive suffix; other words, in the masculine kā, feminine ki; and the latter answers to the Sanskrit ka in asmāka, yuṣhmāka, māmaka, tāwaka. In Hindustānī, therefore, mērī mā, tērī mā. is literally, not ‘mei mater,’ ‘tui mater,’ but ‘mea mater,’ ‘tuæ mater;’ and the feminine termination è answers to the Sanskrit feminine formation (§. 119.). In the masculine the possessives under discussion are sounded mērā, tērā, plural harmārā, tumbhārā. In this it is remarkable that the formative suffix ṛi agrees with the Gothic ra of unsara, izvāra, dual uvkara, iyqvaras. In respect, also, to the transposition of the nasal, tumhrārā for tuhmārā, from tuskūrā, is similar to the Gothic uvkara, unsara, iyqvaras.

PRONOUNS OF THE THIRD PERSON.

341. The Sanskrit is deficient in a simple substantive pronoun of the third person, devoid of gender: that it, however, originally possessed such a pronoun is proved, not only by the unanimous evidence of the European cognate languages, but especially by the circumstance that, in Zend, ṛwā hē and ṛwā hōi (also ṛwā sē, according to §. 55.), and, in Prākrit, sē sē, are used as the genitive and dative of the third person in all genders,* and indeed in the direct sense, and in form analogous to the secondary forms of the first and second person; Sanskrit mē mē, te te, ṛwā te, Zend ṛwā mē or ṛwā nōi, ṛwā te or ṛwā tōi, ṛwā tāhōi (§. 329.) In Sanskrit swā,† lengthened to svē.

* In Zend I remember only examples of the kind where the pronoun mentioned refers to masculines; but in Prākrit sē sē is often found feminine; e.g. Urvasi by Lenz, pp. 46. 55 twice. Still I have not yet met with examples for sē as dative, numerous as the examples of the genitive are. In Zend both cases occur, and the dative, indeed, more frequently than the genitive.

† As to the origin of the Sanskrit swā see §. 946.
PRONOUNS.

[G.Ed. p. 487.] must be considered as the theme of this pronoun, as, according to §. 326., ma, me, twa, twé, are the singular bases of the two first persons. From से śve, in combination with the nominative termination am, (§. 326.) comes स्वयम् swayam, which means “self,” and in the present state of the language is indeclinable in all cases, numbers, and genders. The form swa prevails as the possessive, but is used not only for suus, but for mens and luus, in which it is to be observed, that in the majority of the European cognate languages the possessive of the third person may be also used for the two first, and the Doric σφῶς corresponds as exactly as possible with the Sanskrit swa-s, while ΣΦΙ lies as theme at the base of the plural of the personal pronoun (σφῆς, σφῆ-στ), with the old a weakened to i, as in the plural of the two first persons (§. 332.). The apparent agreement of the base with the second person in the dual is, then, to be explained thus, that in the latter the σ has proceeded from an older τ, but in the third person is primitive. In oδ, oί, έ, for σφω, σφόλ, σφέ—of which only the latter has been retained—from σφω, &c., the digamma, which may remain after σ in the form of φ, has been necessarily suppressed after the σ has become a rough breathing. Thus oί is similar to the Zend ᾱw hoi and ᾱw hé (for hwoi, hehé), and the Prākrit त se for śve. A similar rejection of the v, together with a weakening of the old a to i, shews itself in the Gothic svi-na, si-s, si-h, for svi-na, svi-s, svi-k (see §. 327.). On the other hand, the v has remained in the adverb śvē, as mentioned at §. 150., which evidently belongs to a theme SVI, as hved from HI A, thē from TIIA. As έ, according to §. 69., stands sometimes for the long a, so these forms are, l. c., explained as instrumentals. They might, however, be regarded as locatives, examples of

[G.Ed. p. 488.] which have been pointed out at §. 294. Rem. 2., with an é termination. The Lithuanian and Old Sclavonic in this pronoun follow exactly the analogy of the second
person, and distinguish it from the latter only by the initial \( s \) for \( t \); but, like the Latin, Greek, and German, dispense with the nominative as they are only used reflectively, and use the singular, also, instead of the dual and plural. From the Latin, besides \( sui, suus \), perhaps also \( spontis, sponte \), from \( SPONT \), are to be adduced here, since, according to all probability, the meaning “self,” or “the self, selfness,” is the primitive: \( sp \), however, may be regarded as the modification of \( sv \) (comp. §. 50.), as \( spiro \), in my opinion, is connected with \( swas \), “to breathe.” The Doric \( \psi \nu \), for \( \sigma \phi \nu \), and the Latin \( pse \), of \( i-pse \), which should be declined \( ejus-\)\( psius, ei-psi, &c. \), for \( ipsius, ipsi \), are formed, in like manner, by transposition. As regards the termination \( nt \) of \( SPONT \), it might be carried back to the Sanskrit suffix \( vant \), regarding which see §. 324 and more hereafter. It may here be further remarked, that, in Prâkrit, the pronoun of the second person occurs, amongst other forms, in that of \( pari \) and \( pan \) (Urvasi, pp. 61. 69), so that the \( t \) of \( tva \) is suppressed, but the \( v \) hardened to \( p \). Compare, in the former respect, the Doric \( \phi \nu \) for \( \sigma \phi \nu \), \( vos, vos \), for \( tvus, tvos \) (§. 336.); and, in both respects, the Latin \( porta \), which in this way may be compared with \( dh \) \( dur \), “a door” (\( \theta \)\( pa \)).

312. We here give a connected view of the declension of the pronoun of the third person, devoid of gender, in the singular, which, excepting in the case of the Greek, supplies also the place of the dual and plural.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRÂK.</th>
<th>ZENK.</th>
<th>GREEK.</th>
<th>LAT.</th>
<th>GOTH.</th>
<th>LITH.</th>
<th>OLD SCLAV.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accusative</td>
<td>( \sigma \phi \delta )</td>
<td>( \zeta )</td>
<td>( sc )</td>
<td>( sik )</td>
<td>( sawe)</td>
<td>(^1) ( sya )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental</td>
<td>( \sigma \phi \delta )</td>
<td>( \zeta )</td>
<td>( sc )</td>
<td>( sawi)</td>
<td>(^1) ( soboy)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dative</td>
<td>( sv )</td>
<td>( h) ( \epsilon )</td>
<td>( h) ( \delta )</td>
<td>( o)</td>
<td>( sibi )</td>
<td>( sis )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td>( sv )</td>
<td>( h) ( \epsilon )</td>
<td>( h) ( \delta )</td>
<td>( o)</td>
<td>( suj )</td>
<td>( seina )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locative</td>
<td>( \sigma \phi \delta )</td>
<td>( \zeta )</td>
<td>( sc )</td>
<td>( sawi)</td>
<td>(^1) ( sebye )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) Compare § 330. It is not, however, necessary to assume, that, in the second person, the Lithuanian theme \( taw \) and the Sclavonic \( teh \) have arisen from the Sanskrit genitive \( tava \); but these forms may be regarded as
transpositions of the base तः tva. Both explanations agree in the main, as the syllable tav belongs to the base in the Indian genitive तः tvar also, whether we derive it by Guna from tu, whence तुभ्यं tu-bhyan, "to thee," or regard it as the transposed form of तः tva. In the reflective forms given above, saw and seb are based on the same principle as the tav and teb just mentioned, and hence they may be derived, by transposition, from the Indian base svara; or we may suppose a genitive sava to have existed in Sanskrit also, which language, it may be concluded, originally possessed a complete declension of this pronoun. The Gothic sibya, "kinsman," theme sibyan, Old High German, sippēa, "relationship," "kith," agrees, in a striking manner, with the Slavonic base seb; and it would not be surprising if the "kinsman" has been designated as "the man belonging to him," "his;" and that, therefore, the original r of these Gothic forms has been hardened, as in Slavonic, to b. The Gothic svēs, theme svēsa, "property," is also a derivative from this pronoun.

343. The base तः tu, feminine तः tā, signifies, in Sanskrit, "he," "this," and "that." The Zend form is identical with the Sanskrit: the medial, however, frequently occurs instead of the tenuis, as in the accusative singular masculine, in which the place of तेम tém is commonly supplied by đem, or, still more frequently, by dim. In Greek and German this pronoun has assumed the functions of the article, which is not found in the Sanskrit and Zend, nor in the Latin, Lithuanian, and Slavonic. The bases TO,

[G. Ed. p. 490.] Gothic THA (§. 87.), feminine, TĀ, TH, Gothic THÔ (§. 69.), correspond regularly with the Sanskrit-Zend tu, tā, with which the Lithuanian demonstrative base TA, nominative masculine tas, "this," feminine tā, is completely identical. The Old Slavonic base is, as in Greek, in the masculine and neuter* to, in the feminine tu (§. 255. a.), but in the nominative masculine drops the vowel; hence t', tu, to, "this," m. f. n. This pronoun does not occur, in its simple state, in Latin, with the exception of the adverbial

* Th, t' with the semi-vowel ्."
accusative forms *tum, tune (like hunc), tam, tan-dem, and lamen. The latter resembles surprisingly the Sanskrit locative तस्मिन ta-smin, "in this" (§ 201.), only that the s is dropped, as in the Lithuanian lamė, (p. 176 G. ed.); on which account I am inclined to replace the derivation I formerly gave of it by transposition from the Greek μέτρου, by that which I now offer, and which is less remote. Moreover, in Latin, the derivative forms talis, tantus, tol, totidem, toties, lotus,* spring from this pronoun, and will be treated of hereafter. It appears, however, to be declined in the compound iste, of which the first member is is either to be regarded as a petrified nominative masculine, the case-sign of which, unconscious of its derivation, is retained in the oblique cases—istius for ejuslius, compare the German jedermann's—or, which seems to me less probable, the s is a pure phonetic affix, adopted on account of the favourite combination of s with t (compare §§ 95. 96.).

341. In the same way that iste is compounded in Latin, so also, in Sanskrit and Zend, the base ta combines with another pronoun prefixed to it, in fact, with ṭ, and thus forms यतेत "this," "that," Zend यतेत aṭa (§. 28.). The nominative singular is, in Sanskrit, यथः यथा, यथा यथो, यथान्तः यथात; in Zend यथायेत aṭah यथायेत aṭah, यथायेत aṭat. In Greek, aυτός is a similar compound, the first syllable of which, aυ, will subsequently be remarked upon. [G. Ed. p. 491.] This aυτός is again combined with the article as a prefix to it, and forms oυτος, aυτη, τουτο, for ὅ-αυ-τος, ἡ-αυ-τη, τo-αυ-τo. There are several ways in which oυτος, τουτo, may be supposed to have arisen: in the first place as ὁ-ουτος, τ'-ουτo, by suppressing the vowel of the article and weakening the α of the diphthong αυ to o, both changes being made to prevent the whole word from being too ponderous, for α is

* Regarding lotus see p. 1343 G. ed. Note.
the heaviest of the three representatives of the Indian ए (ə e, o); and for this reason əv appears to be especially the representative of the Vyiddhi diphthong एः उः, while for एः ə = a + u, is found either ev or ov. In the feminine form əvəη, if we distribute it thus, h'əvəη, the diphthong remains unweakened, as in ταυτό. But əvəη may also be derived from ‘ā-ुτη, and the loss of the first element of the diphthong may be assumed: the gender would then be expressed in both members of the compound, and a better distinction would be made from the masculine and neuter base τούτο. But if, as appears to me preferable, we make the latter accord with the explanation which has just been given of the feminine form, the o of ov will then be ascribed to the article, and we shall likewise assume that the a of əv is dropped; thus, ə-ुτος, το-ुτο. Max. Schmidt (De Pronominie Gr. et Lat. p. 38) sees in əvτος only the article compounded with itself, and assumes that ν is inserted; thus əvτος for ोτος, əvη for ०η. He adduces, in support of his view, ोςοντος, τ cougar1ντος, τηλικουτος, which he supposes to have admitted a similar insertion. I am of opinion, on the contrary, that these forms do not contain the simple base of the article TO as the last element of their composition, but 'ΑΥΤΟ; for why should not this pronoun, though itself already a compound, 

[G. Ed. p. 492.] admit, just as well as the article, of being combined with words preceding it? I do not agree with Max. Schmidt in explaining the adverbs ἐνταυθά, ἐντευθέν, for ἐνθαῦθα, ἐνθεῦθεν, Ionic ἐνθαύτα, ἐνθεὔτεν, by the simple duplication of the suffixes θα, θεν, but I consider them to be compounded of two adverbs of similar formation. Though ἀθα, ἀθεφ, from the pronominal base 'Α, of which more hereafter, have not been retained in use by themselves, still I look upon ἐνταυθά as the combination of ἐνθ' + ἀθα, and ἐνθεῦθεν as that of ἐνθεφ + ἀθεφ. In order to avoid the con-

* See Vocalismus, Rem. 2. p. 193, &c.
currence of two breathings in the two following syllables, the breathing of the former syllable is suppressed, or, as in the Ionic dialect, that of the latter is dropped. It may remain a question, whether the ε of ê̂θεv is the thin sound of the a of â̂θεv, in which case the preceding adverb has lost not only its v, but its ε also, or whether â̂θεv has been weakened by the loss of its a. In the latter case ê̂νταθa may be divided into ê̂ντα-θa. It is at least more natural to suppose the combination of two adverbs, and the weakening of a single one, on account of the ponderous nature of the compound, than to assume the mere doubling of the formative suffix and the insertion of a redundant v, for neither part of this assumption can be supported by analogous phenomena elsewhere.

345. In the nominative singular masculine and feminine the Sanskrit substitutes—and in this the Gothic remarkably coincides with it—for the T sound of the pronoun under discussion an s, which in Zend, according to §. 53, becomes ω h, and in Greek the rough breathing, hence Sanskrit sa, só, tat, Gothic su, só, thulz, Zend há, há, tat, Greek ὁ, ὃ, τό. The Old Latin has introduced into the accusative this originally purely subjective pronominal base: sum for eum, and sum for eam, also supsas as nominative for su-ipsa.* [G. Ed. p. 493.]

As this s is excluded from the neuter, we have found in it (§. 131) a satisfactory explanation of the nominative sign, the s of which is likewise foreign to the neuter. A remnant of the old s of the base is still preserved by the Greek in the adverbs σύμερον and σύτες, though as these compounds express an accusative relation, not that of a nominative, they accord with the use of the Sanskrit language less than the Attic forms τίμερον, τίτες, as τά τά is the general theme, but ἃ sa only that of the nominative.

The first member of the said compounds occurs in the primary form or theme, the final \( o \) of which (\( = \text{ṣ} a \)) has been changed into \( e \), having been melted down with the following \( e \) and \( \eta \); thus \( τ\acute{η}τες, σ\grave{η}τες \), from \( τε-\text{ετες}, σε-\text{ετες} \), for \( το-\text{ετες}, σο-\text{ετες} \); \( τ\acute{ι}μ\text{έρουν}, σ\acute{ι}μ\text{έρουν} \), from \( τε-\text{ημ\text{έρουν}}, σε-\text{ημ\text{έρουν}} \), for \( το-\text{ημ\text{έρουν}}, σο-\text{ημ\text{έρουν}} \). These adverbs correspond to the Sanskrit adverbial compounds (\( \text{Avayi}-\text{bh\text{ä}vana} \)), which contain a substantive, assuming an accusative neuter form as their last member; e.g. \( \text{गात्मण्डम् यत्} \) \( \text{ṣra} \text{̃} \text{da} \) \( \text{Shraddha} \), feminine, “troth.”

316. The Greek falls into an abuse, in extending the substitution of the rough breathing for the \( T \) sound also to the nominative plural, as in \( \text{οί, αί} \), while the cognate languages preserve the Doric-epic forms \( \text{ταί, ταί} \), as the original: Sanskrit \( \text{ते} \) \( \text{ले}, \text{ता} \) स, Zend \( \text{yus} \) \( \text{le} \), \( \text{y\acute{u}d} \) \( \text{tō} \), Gothic \( \text{tha} \), \( \text{thōs} \) (compare §. 228.).

317. With reference to the masculine nominative singular, we have, moreover, to notice the remarkable coincidence of the Greek, Gothic, and Sanskrit in retaining the case-sign, so that \( \text{δ} \) for \( \text{ος} \) corresponds to the Sanskrit-Gothic \( \text{sa} \) for \( \text{sas} \).

[G. Ed. p. 494.] The latter appears analogous to the interrogative \( \text{hvus}, \text{“who?”} \) in Gothic (§. 135.). In Sanskrit, however, the suppression of the case-sign is not quite universal; for before a stop we find \( \text{स: suh}, \text{सो} \) \( \text{sō} \), euphonic for \( \text{sas} \) (§. 22. and Gramm. Crit. §. 75. a.); and \( \text{सो} \) \( \text{sō} \), before words beginning with \( a \), according to a general principle of sound from \( \text{sas} \), by melting down the \( s \) to \( u \), and regularly contracting the \( a+u \) to \( \text{δ} \) (§. 2.). On the form \( \text{sō} \) is based the Zend \( \text{yōu} \) \( \text{hō} \), the \( \text{δ} \) of which is retained; so that \( \text{yōu} \) \( \text{ha} \), which might be expected for \( \text{ṣ sa} \), does not occur. Although, then, \( \text{yōu} \) \( \text{hō} \) is strikingly similar to the Greek \( \text{δ} \), still the relationship of the two forms cannot be looked for in the \( o \)-sound, as the Greek \( \text{δ} \) rests on the suppression of the case-sign and usual substitution of \( o \) for \( \text{ṣ} \) \( a \) (§. 4.), while the Zend \( \text{hō} \) is to be referred to the existence of a
case-sign (u for s), and its contraction with the a of the base to a.

348. The reason why this pronoun gladly dispenses with the usual nominative sign s may be, partly, because the said case-sign has itself proceeded from the base su, and that su does not admit of being recombined with itself; and, partly—and this perhaps is the surer ground—that the pronouns, in general, are so strongly and vividly personified by themselves, that they are not in need of a very energetic and animated sign of personality; for which reason, although अहम aham, "I," तुम tum, "thou," तुम्न ayam, "this," स्वयम swayam, "self," have a termination, it is not that of the usual nominative, but they appear as neuters in the more objective or accusative garb; while तस्म asū, m. f. "that," if its final diphthong is combined with the u of the oblique [G. Ed. p. 495.] case तम amu (compare §. 156.), is completely devoid of termination, and merely adopts the Vṛiddhi augment of the final vowel of the base.* The Latin obeys the same principle in the pronouns hi-c, ille, iste, ipsae, which are deprived of the nominative sign, and for which we might have expected his-c (compare hun-c from hu-me), illus, istus, and ipsus, which latter actually occurs; and in the same language the relative qui is distinguished from the more energetic interrogative quis by the absence of the nominative sign. In agreement with this principle stands also the circumstance, that in Sanskrit the masculine pronominal bases in a, in the plural nominative have not, like other words, as for their termination, but, in like manner, suppress the case suffix, and extend the a of the base to र i, by the admixture of a purely phonetic i; hence त्र tu from which the dative and ablative त्र-भ्यस, genitive त्र-शाम, locative त्र-श्न. It has been before pointed out (§. 228.) what relation the cognate languages bear to Sanskrit in this respect. And it may

* The belief in this actually being the case is supported by the Pali, in which the form asu, without Vṛiddhi, corresponds to the Sanskrit asū.
be observed, further, that the pronouns of the first and second person do not admit, in the plural, the termination *as, but employ वगः वगः गः गः, गः गः, with a neuter singular form, and in the Veda dialect चस्यम् चस्यम्, चस्यम् चस्यम्, after the usage of pronouns of the third person. The Greek forms ἄμμες, ἄμμες, ἄμμες, ἄμμες, appear, therefore, so much the more to be a more recent adaptation to the ordinary mode of formation; and what (§§. 335, 337.) has been said regarding the s of the Lithuanian me's, yus, the Gothic veis, yus, and the Latin nos, vos, obtains additional confirmation from the present remark. The pronominal base अम् aṃ, “that,” also avoids, in the masculine, the nominative-termination *as, and forms aṃ, *illi, which serves as a theme to the oblique plural cases.

[G. Ed. p. 496.] with the exception of the accusative: hence अमिभिः aṃ-bhīs, अमिभिः aṃ-bhīs, अमिभिः aṃ-bhīs, अमिभिः aṃ-bhīs. These forms confirm the opinion that the nominative te also, and the like, are void of inflexion.

319. We here give a general view of the entire declension of the pronoun under discussion. From the Latin we adduce the compound is-te, as the simple form does not occur. The Zend forms in brackets I have not met with, but have formed them according to the analogy of the compound यास्य, यास्य, and other pronouns of the third person, with which we may suppose the base यास्य to have originally agreed in inflexion. Observe, also, the occasional weakening of the t to d, mentioned in §. 343. Those cases of the Lithuanian and Sclavonic to which * is prefixed, etymologically do not belong to this place, but to the compound त् tya, mentioned in §. 353.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SINGULAR.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MASCULINE.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N. sa, sah, só, hó, ó, is-TE, sa, las, ě.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ac. tam, tēm, τόν, is-TUM, thana, tān, ě.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. tēna, (tī), ......</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>lū, tinři, *tyem.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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SINGULAR.

MASCULINE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sanskrit</th>
<th>Zend</th>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>Latin</th>
<th>Gothic</th>
<th>Lith.</th>
<th>Old Scl.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D. tasmāi,1 (tahmāi),1</td>
<td>τῶ,</td>
<td>is-TI,2</td>
<td>thamma,3</td>
<td>tam,4</td>
<td>tommā.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ab. tasmī, (tahmēi),6</td>
<td>. . .</td>
<td>is-TO(D)</td>
<td>. . .</td>
<td>. . .</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. tasya, (tahē),7</td>
<td>τῶ,</td>
<td>is-TĪUS,3</td>
<td>thīs,</td>
<td>to,</td>
<td>togu.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NEUTER.

N. Ac. tat,13 tā,13 τά,13 is-TUD,13 thata,14 tai,15 to.16

The rest like the Masculine.

FEMININE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N. sā,</th>
<th>hā,</th>
<th>ē, i,</th>
<th>is-TA,</th>
<th>sā,</th>
<th>tā,</th>
<th>tu.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ac. tam (taum),</td>
<td>τα, τίν,</td>
<td>is-TAM,</td>
<td>thō,</td>
<td>tai</td>
<td>tu.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. tayā, (lāmya),18</td>
<td>. . .</td>
<td>. . .</td>
<td>. . .</td>
<td>tā,</td>
<td>toya.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. tasyāt,19 (tayhāt),20</td>
<td>τά, τή,</td>
<td>is-TĪ,</td>
<td>thizai,21</td>
<td>tai,</td>
<td>to.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ab. tasyās,19 (tayhāt),20</td>
<td>. . .</td>
<td>is-TA(D)</td>
<td>. . .</td>
<td>. . .</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. tasyās,19 (tāmya),20</td>
<td>τάς, τής,</td>
<td>is-TĪUS,22</td>
<td>thizis,19</td>
<td>tāς,</td>
<td>toya.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. tasyām,19 (lāmya),21</td>
<td>. . .</td>
<td>. . .</td>
<td>. . .</td>
<td>tonym,25</td>
<td>to.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 See §. 166. 2 Isti, and similar pronominal forms, differ from the common second declension, to which they belong, in this particular, that they preserve the case-termination in preference to the final vowel of the base; thus, isti for istoi, opposed to lypo for lypoi. 3 Regarding mm, from sm, see §. 170., and with reference to the termination §. 356. Rem. 3. 1 §. 176. 2 §. 267. sub finem. 6 We might, also, expect σω, τανή, and σω, τανή, according to the analogy of σω, σω, which often occurs as well as σω (from the base a), and σω, a, and similar forms (-§. 41. and 56. a.). 7 §. 189. 8 §. 269. 9 §. 201. 10 §. 343. 11 §§. 176. 197. 12 The m comes from the appended pronoun sma (comp. §. 267. sub f.): in the instrumental tym, on the contrary, it belongs to the case-sign (§. 266.). 13 §. 155. 156. 14 §§. 155. and 281. 15 §. 157. 16 The Sclavonic to, and similar pronominal neuters, are to be explained, like the Greek, through the suppression of a T-sound; while substantive and adjective forms in o— with the exception of those from bases in s (as νομο from ΝΕΒΕΣ)—have lost a final nasal, which the Greek retains, both
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according to the euphonic law in §. 255. l. 17 §. 266. 18 § 171.
19 §. 172. 20 §. 172. Note *, p. 189. 21 §. 356. Rem. 3. 22 If we assume that the termination you, peculiar to the pronouns, which in §. 189. is considered as the transposed form of the Sanskrit termination sya, belonged originally to the feminine, and from that gender has been unorganically transferred to the others, then (is)tius—from (is)ti-jus, for (is)ta-jus—would agree tolerably well with the Sanskrit tasyás, with the loss of the s preceding j; in this resembling the Scelavonic tayo for tasya, §. 271., and shortening the last á but one; after which from the short a, as is so frequently done before a final s, an unorganic u is formed. 23 From tosyas, §. 271. 24 §. 202. 25 §. 268. Note *

DUAL.

MASCULINE.


N. A. tāu, tā, tāu, tā, ta.
G. L. tāyōs, (tāyō), G. toīn, G. tā, toyā.

NEUTER.

N. Ac. tē, (tē), tā, tō, . . . . tye.

The rest like the Masculine.

FEMININE.

N. Ac. tē, (tē), tā, tie, tye.
G. L. tāyōs, . . . . G. tāiū, G. tā, toyā.

1 Vēdic form, see §. 208. 2 §. 221. 3 §. 215. 4 §. 273.,
where, however, the reason for the ye, instead of the to-be-anticipated o, was incorrectly assigned. The truth is, obyema is founded on the Sanskrit base द्वय ubhayā, nom. ubhayam, "both"; and with regard to the designation of the number two, we must observe, that the Lithuanian, also, forms some cases from an extended theme in īa, euphonic ie; viz. the gen. dwiey-ā, and the dative dwie-m; the former, with regard to its y before the case-termination, agrees with the Scelavonic dwoy-ā and Sanskrit dway-ōs (§. 273. Note †): the theme of both cases is dwiec, from dwia, and is founded, in my opinion, on the Sanskrit प्राय dwaya, "a pair," with the suppression of the a preceding the y. On this, then, is based, also, the Scelavonic
PRONOUNS.

487

dvyem, as also tyem, on the compound pronominal base य tya (§ 353).

1 § 228.348. Regarding the Lithuanian tie see, also, § 235. Note 1, and for the Slavonic tì § 274.  2 § 239.  3 § 275.  4 § 219.

The surprising agreement between the Sanskrit तेस् tēs and Lithuanian tais is so far fortuitous, as that the Sanskrit has rejected its bh and the Lithuanian the m derived from ḍ, independently of each other. The Slavonic *tyemi, from tyemis (§ 277.), points to a Lithuanian ta-mis, and is analogous to the Vedic forms like साप्त च अस्मि aśeśbhis, mentioned in § 219., and to the common pronominal-instrumental रूम द-hbis, “through this,” from the base द a. It is, however, doubtful whether the ye of *tyemi is founded on the corruption of the Sanskrit त bh of a Vedic form which may be supposed to have existed, tēbhis, according to § 255. e., or whether, as I am more inclined to think, this case, like several others, belongs to the compound base य tya, to which, also, is to be assigned the

PLURAL.

MASCULINE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N. tē,1</td>
<td>tē,1</td>
<td>τοί, οί,1</td>
<td>is-TI,1</td>
<td>thai,1</td>
<td>*tie,1</td>
<td>ti,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ac. tān,</td>
<td>(tān),2</td>
<td>τοῦς,</td>
<td>is-TŌS,</td>
<td>than,</td>
<td>tus, tās,</td>
<td>ty,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. tīs,4</td>
<td>(tīs),</td>
<td>. . . . . .</td>
<td>. . . . .</td>
<td>. . . . .</td>
<td>. . . . .</td>
<td>*tyem,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Ab. tēbhayas,</td>
<td>tēbhīd,</td>
<td>s. Loc.</td>
<td>is-TĪS,5</td>
<td>thaim,5</td>
<td>*tiem(u)</td>
<td>*tyem,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. tēdham,6</td>
<td>(taēshaim),10</td>
<td>τῶν,</td>
<td>is-TŌRUM,8</td>
<td>thīd,8</td>
<td>tā,</td>
<td>tyech,11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. tēshu,</td>
<td>(taēshva),</td>
<td>D. toīva,</td>
<td>. . . . .</td>
<td>τūse,</td>
<td>. . . . .</td>
<td>tyech,11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N. Ac. tānī, th,12 tā,13 | τά,13 | is-TA,13 | thō,13 | . . . | ta,14 |

The rest like the Masculine.

NEUTER.

FEMININE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N. tās,</td>
<td>(tdo),</td>
<td>ταῖ, aĩ,1</td>
<td>is-TAE,1</td>
<td>thōs,</td>
<td>tos,</td>
<td>ty,15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ac. tās,</td>
<td>(tdo),</td>
<td>τᾶς,</td>
<td>is-TĀS,</td>
<td>thōs,</td>
<td>tas,</td>
<td>ty,15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. tābhīs,</td>
<td>(tābīs),</td>
<td>. . . . . .</td>
<td>. . . . .</td>
<td>. . . . .</td>
<td>. . . . .</td>
<td>*tyem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Ab. tābhīyas,</td>
<td>(tābhīd),</td>
<td>s. L.</td>
<td>is-TĪS,</td>
<td>thaim,16</td>
<td>tom(u)</td>
<td>*tyem,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. tāsām,6</td>
<td>(tdonshaim),17</td>
<td>τάων,</td>
<td>is-TĀRUM,9</td>
<td>thīo,9</td>
<td>tā,</td>
<td>tyech,11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. tāsu,</td>
<td>tāhva,</td>
<td>D. ταῶν,</td>
<td>. . . . .</td>
<td>tosn,</td>
<td>. . . . .</td>
<td>tyech,11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 § 228.348. Regarding the Lithuanian tie see, also, § 235. Note 1, and for the Slavonic tì § 274.  2 § 239.  3 § 275.  4 § 219.
singular instrumental *tyem, as from the base to only *tom could proceed, according to the analogy of *rabom, from the base *rabo. On the other hand, the locative *tyech is not to be referred to this place, as all o bases in this case have *ye corresponding to the Sanskrit *t; as rabyech, from the theme *rabo. Concurrent forms are wanting in the common declension for *tyech: it answers, however, to *तेष्म तेष्म, just as the locative of similar sound does to तेषु तेषु; and for it also, therefore, we do not have recourse

[G. Ed. p. 500.] to the pronoun compounded with य या, however natural it might appear from the point of view of the Grammar, which is limited to the Sclavonic alone, that all the *ye, which occur in this pronoun, are of the same origin. 5 From *istibus for istobus, see §. 244. 6 §§. 215. and 288. Rem. 4. 7 §§. 215. and 235. Note †. 8 §. 276. 9 §. 248. 10 Comp. एश्नाम aśteinām, “horum,” from the base a, Vend. S. p. 230, and elsewhere (erroneously म s for sh, see §§. 51. 52.). 11 §. 284. Note 6. 12 §. 234. Note †. 13 §. 231. 14 §. 274. 15 §. 271. 16 This has found its way from the other genders into the feminine, where we should expect thóm, while in the masculine and neuter the ai has its ancient fixed position (§. 288. Rem. 4.). In Sclavonic, all oblique plural cases are borrowed from the masculine, hence *tyemi, *tyem, *tyech, for *tyami, *tyam, *tuach, or *tami, *tam, *tach. 17 Compare the often-occurring एश्नाम aśteinām, “harum” (§. 56*), Sanskrit एश्नाम, from the base a. Polysyllabic bases in Zend shorten the feminine d in the genitive plural; hence, not aśteinām, but एश्नाम aśteinām (according to §. 56*) answers to the Sanskrit ēlīsām.

350. The weakening of the t to d, mentioned in §. 343., which occasionally enters into the pronominal base ta, coincides with that which takes place in Greek in the appended particle δε, which, when isolated, is used as a conjunction, and to which no more suitable origin can be assigned than the pronominal base TO. The weakening of the vowel σ to ε resembles that which occurs in the uninflected vocative of bases in σ (§. 204.), as also in the equally uninflected accusatives με, σέ, ε (§. 326.). The descent of the tenuis to the medial occurs also in Sanskrit, in the isolated neuter form i-dam, “this,” and a-das, “that,” inasmuch as, in my opinion, this is the proper distribution* which with

reference to *i-dam* is supported, also, by the Latin *i-dem*, *qui-dem*. In Sanskrit इदम् *i-dam* and छदम् *a-das* are limited to the nominative and accusative neuter, which are the same in sound, and are deficient in the formation of the other cases, which originally may have been prolonged to them; as the Greek δὲ has still left behind it, in Homer, the plural-dative δεσσί, δεσί, (τοίςδεσσί, τοίςδεσί), which, according to what was said in §. 253. Rem., regarding the dative in εσ-σί, sounds very homogeneous to the Sanskrit neuter *das*, probably a weakened form of *dat*. As to the proof of the relation of the idea of the conjunction δέ to that of our pronoun, it is sufficient to remark, generally, that all genuine conjunctions in the Indo-European family of languages, as far as their origin can be traced, are derived from pronouns, the meaning of which frequently lies more or less obscured in them. Those from μέν and δέ are contrasted with one another like "this" and "that," or "the other;" and the connection of our German aber, Old High German afar, with the Indian अपरस् *apara-s*, "the other," has been already shewn elsewhere,* and in the same manner the Gothic *ith*, "but," of which more hereafter, is of pronominal origin, just as the Latin *au-tem*.

351. A descent from the tenuis to t' e medial, similar to that which we have observed in the Greek δέ, and in δείβα, which will be discussed hereafter, is exhibited in Latin in the adverbs *dum*, *demum*, *donec*, *denique*, which all, with more or less certainty, belong to our demonstrative base. Perhaps *dudum*, also, is to be referred to this class, and is to be regarded as the doubling of the base *du* for *tu*, *to*, as *totus*, which has retained the old tenuis. In Sanskrit, the doubling of pronouns, in which both are nevertheless declined, expresses multiplicity; *yds* *yas* signifies "whoever," "quicunque," and *yān* *yam*,

---

* Vocalismus, p. 155.
"quemcunque," &c., and sa sah, tan, tam &c., answer to them.

[Totus is properly "this and this," "the one and the other half," hence "the whole." The case is the same with quisquis. In dudum, "long ago," the notion of multiplicity is equally clear; and for this reason I prefer viewing it as the combination of two similar elements rather than as diu and dum. The same relation, in a phonetic respect, that dudum has to totus, dum has to tum, which latter has been designated above (§. 343.) as the accusative. The circumstance, that in those pronominal adverbs the accusative inflexion does not stand in its customary sense, ought not to divert us from this mode of derivation; for in adverbs the case-inflexions very frequently overstep their ordinary signification. Notwithstanding, it cannot be denied that, in all pronominal adverbs of this kind, or at least in some of them, the m might also belong to the appended pronoun soma, which is so widely diffused in Sanskrit and its kindred languages, and has been conjectured to exist in ta-men as analogous to the Sanskrit locative tasmin, and in immo by assimilation from ismo.*

According to this mode of explanation, in the Latin forms dum, tum, tam, quam, &c., there would be exactly as much left of the appended pronoun, and the case-terminations combined with it, as in our German datives, like dem, wem, and the Sclavonic locatives, as tom. The locative would be very suitable for dum, "since," "while," (in which time), and tum in the meaning "then," and consequently du-m and tu-m would be = Sanskrit तत्समस्मि ta-smin, Old Sclavonic tom. For the meaning, "hereupon," which in Sanskrit is expressed by ततं tatas, (literally "from there"), it might be better to refer to the ablative तत्समत् ta-smāt, for it is not necessary that tum, in all its meanings, should belong to one and the

* In the author's Essay on Demonstrative Bases, p. 21.
same case-form, as the m approaches very [G Ed. p. 503.] closely to the terminations ते smdi, स्मात smdt, and त्मतं smn.

352. Dēnum, considered as a demonstrative form, agrees exceedingly well, apart from the weakening of the consonants, with the Greek τηµος, with respect to which the obsolete form dēmus is to be remarked. In τηµος, however, to which the relative ἤµος corresponds, there is no necessity to follow Buttmann in regarding the latter portion of it as the substantive ἢµαρ, notwithstanding the apparent inducement for so doing contained in αὐτὴµαρ; but I prefer dividing thus, τη-µος, ἤ-µος, and I consider τη, ἤ, to be merely the lengthening of the base TO, as according to §§. 3. 4., ο = ओ a, and η = ओ d. Thus this η coincides with the cognate Sanskrit त, in several pronominal derivations, with the base vowel lengthened, as यात्रा yd-vat, "how much," "how long," "while," &c., and with the word answering to it, तावधम tā-vat. Nay, we might not perhaps venture too far if we were to recognise in μος a corruption of वत vat, the ν being hardened to µ, as we perceive happens among other words in δρेमω = द्रवामि dravāmi. "I run," (p. 114), with the favourite transition of τ to s, which is necessary at the end of words if the T sound is not to be entirely dropped, modifications which have aided us in explaining several forms of importance in Grammar ( §§. 152. 183.). In dēnum, dēmus, however, the demonstrative force is not so clearly perceptible as in the cognate Greek expression, and it lies concealed under the usual translation, "then first," or "at last," which does not affect the general sense of the sentence. Still nunc demum venis? means, properly, "now comest thou at this (so late a time) ?" The time is doubly denoted; and in this lies the emphasis, first by nunc, from the pronominal base nu, and next by demum. In such adverbs, however, of place and time, it is [G. Ed. p. 504 ] not required to express the place and time formally, and this is done very rarely. In general, the mind has to understand
these categories in the interior, as it were, of the verbal form. It is the property of the pronouns to convey the secondary notion of space, which then admits of being transferred to time. Thus our *wo*, "where," has reference to place; *wann*, "when," to time; *da*, "then" or "there," to both; but the pronominal idea alone is formally represented in all three. When it is required adverbially to denote absolutely definite divisions of time, a pronoun is naturally combined with the designation of time in question, as in *hodie*, σήμερον, and *heute*, "to-day," (Old High German, *haitu*, § 162.). But if, in these expressions, one of the ideas combined in them were to lose its formal designation, that of time would most easily be dispensed with; the important matter being that it is "on this" and not "on that (day);" and the language therefore adheres more tenaciously to the pronominal element than to that of time, which is very faintly seen in our *heute*, and even in the Old High German *haitu*. Hence I cannot believe that the adverbs *dum*, *demum*, *donec*, *denique*, are connected with the term for "day" (§ 122.), which is common to the Latin and the Sanskrit, to which Hartung (Gr. Particles, I. 230), besides the forms which have been mentioned, refers, among other words, *jam* and the Gothic *yu*, "now," "already," and *yuthan*, "already," as also the appended *dam* in *qui-dem*, regarding which see above (§ 350.). In the first place, in the *dam* of *quon-dam*, and in the *dem* of *tan-dem*, we might admit the term denoting "day," without being compelled, from the reason given above, to this explanation, still less to the inference that *qui-dem*, *qui-dem*, and *i-dem*, also have arisen in this manner. If *quondam* contains the name of "day," then its *dam* approaches most nearly to the Sanskrit accusative धाम् *dyām* from धो *dyā*, "heaven," which, like other [G. Ed. p. 505.] appellations of heaven, may also have signified "day," as a shoot from the root दिस् *div*, "to shine," (§ 122.). To this accusative धाम् *dyām*, the Greek *ἡν*, "long," corresponds, if, as Hartung conjectures, it is
taken from an appellation of "day," like the Latin *diu* (Sanskrit द्व, "day.") On the other hand, I prefer referring the particle द्व to our demonstrative base, the significant and animating force of which is evinced clearly enough in the way in which it is used. We return to the Latin *dōnecc*—the more complete form of which, *dōnicum,* has been already, in another place, divided into *dōnicum*—since I see in it a connection, in formation and base [G. Ed. p. 506.] with the Greek ῥωίκα, of which hereafter. "So long as" is equivalent to "the time in which," or "in which time," "how long a time," and *do* here represents the pronominal idea, and *nec, nicum,* that of time, as it also actually expresses, which will be shewn hereafter, a division of time. In the

* Perhaps we should also class under this head द्वेपा, and divide it into द्वेपा, considering it as "day-time." The first member of the compound would have lost the T sound of the Sanskrit base द्व, as, in § 122., we have seen Ju proceed from Dyu, and the rough breathing would, as frequently happens in Greek—e.g. in ῥπα, answering to ἴεκρ and ὑκρτ—supply the place of the j. As regards the second portion of द्वेपा, we might easily suppose it connected with μέπος. If this idea be well founded, then द्वेपा would mean "day's-side" or "light-side" (of time). But μέπος admits, also, of comparison with a word which, in Sanskrit, means time in general and day of the week; for by assuming the frequently-mentioned hardening of a v to µ (cf. p. 115, l. 3), and a shortening of the middle vowel, we arrive at the Sanskrit वार वारा, which has been before the subject of discussion (§ 309, p. 425, l. 8), and with which, too, our Mal, "time," Gothic mel (theme mêla), is connected. According to this view, द्वेपा would, therefore, signify "day's-time," in which case an etymological connection between μέπος and μέπος might still exist, inasmuch as μείρα, from the root र (eīμαρ), is probably connected with the Sanskrit root var (व्र), "to cover" and "to choose"; whence var (nominative varam), "the gift, lent by a god or a Brahman," "grace"; and whence is derived, also, vāra, "opportunity," "time," &c. For further particulars regarding the root वर var (व्रर) and its branches in the European cognate languages, see my Vocalismus, p. 106.

† Influence of the Pronouns on the Formation of Words, p. 12.
Sanskrit यद्वत, on the other hand, from the relative base या, which signifies both "so long as" and "until," the pronominal idea is alone represented; and we have hereby a fresh proof of the existence of a demonstrative element in donec, donicum. Dênique, in like manner, with regard to its origin, appears to be related to तपिका, to which it bears a surprising resemblance, with qu for k, as in quis, quid, corresponding to कस kas, किम kim, कोś, कोίς, &c.

353. The pronominal base त ta is combined, in Sanskrit, with the relative base या, for the formation of a new pronoun of similar signification, which belongs especially to the Veda dialect, and, like many other Veda words, has found more frequent use in the European cognate languages than in the common Sanskrit. The a of त ta, is suppressed in this compound, hence य tya; and in the nominative of the personal genders, as in the simple त tu, the T sound is replaced by s; hence स्यस syas, स्या syā, स्यर tyat; accusative स्यम tyam, स्यम tydm, स्यर tyat, &c. The base sya, which is limited to the nominative, with its feminine form syd, possesses a complete declension in several cognate languages, and in the Sclavonic has found its way into the neuter also. The Gothic has adhered most closely to the Sanskrit, and does not permit this pronoun to extend beyond the singular nominative. Moreover, only the feminine form si remains; and one could wish that a masculine syi-s, for sya-s, (according to §. 135,) occurred with it. Most of the forms, however, which express, in Gothic the idea "he," and its feminine, have proceeded from the demonstrative base इ, among which si, though, as it were, an alien, has found its place. This si, from the base स्यौ=Sanskrit syd, is an abbreviation of sya, according to the analogy of the substantive declension of the like termination (Grimm's second strong declension), as ठिवि for thiuya, from the base thiud.

354. The Old High German siu—we will leave it undecided
whether it should be written syu*—is more exactly re-
tained than the Gothic si, and has not entirely dropped
the Sanskrit छा d, of छा syd, but has first shortened it to
a, and then weakened it to u.† U, however, in Old High
German, is a favourite letter after i or y (Vocalismus,
p. 246. Rem. 80.). The form siu, in Old High German, is
not so isolated as si in Gothic; but from the base siō
springs also an accusative sia, and in the plural the form
sio, which is common to the nominative and accusative,
and, in a Gothic dress, would be syōs, in Sanskrit
स्म्यान्य syās. Contrasted with the singular nominative
siu, the accusative sia may appear remarkable, for in
both cases similar forms might have been expected.
The difference, however, consists in this, that the nomina-
tive form, at the oldest period to which we can arrive by
the history of the language, terminated in a vowel without
any case-sign whatever, while in the accusative the vowel of
the base was protected by a nasal. This nasal, then, may
have preserved the old quantity of a, just as, in Greek, a
final a frequently occurs in places where a nasal was per-
mitted to follow it by the old Grammar; while, where a short
a sound is found originally unprotected, or [G. Ed. p. 508.]
accompanied by consonants not nasal, it is usually changed
into e or o; hence ἐπτα, ἐνέα, δέκα, answering to the Sanskrit
saptan, navan, daśan, though from these likewise in the nomi-
native and accusative, according to §§. 139. 313., sapta, &c.;
ेदेता answering to सदिष्ठम adikṣham, पोदा to पदम padam,
but एदेते to सदिष्ठ adikṣhat, लुके! to चुक व्रिका, एदेतात to सदिष्ठात adikṣhata.

355. While the Gothic article, like that in Greek, is to

* See p. 367, Rem. 5. ; and Vocalismus, p. 234, Rem. 31.
† Respecting u, as lighter than a and heavier than i, see Vocalismus,
p. 227, Rem. 16.
be referred to the bases discussed in §. 343., त sa, सा sd, त tu, ता tā, the High German, as has been before remarked (§. 283. Rem. 5.), attaches itself chiefly to the compound त्य tya, fem. tyā, and introduces this into the nominative also; hence, in the feminine, diu (or perhaps dyu), as above siu; accusative dia, answering to the Sanskrit त्यम tyām, and in the nominative and accusative plural dio = tyās. With regard to the masculine, compare, with the Sanskrit nominative त्य tye, the form die, which in High German has found its way also into the accusative, which in this language is everywhere the same as the nominative. In the neuter, diu agrees with similar Old High German forms, from substantive bases in ia, as chunnu. In the masculine singular, and in those cases of the neuter which are the same as the masculine, the compound nature of our pronominal base is less palpable; and taking it as our starting point, or restricting our views to it, we should have classed the forms dēr, dēs, dēmu, dēn, not under tya, but, like the Gothic forms of kindred signification, under the simple base त ta. But if dēr, dēn, be compared with the corresponding feminine cases diu, dia, and with the masculine plural die, without the supposition—which is refuted by the Sanskrit, Lithuanian, and Scalvonic—that in the latter word a redundant i is inserted,

[G. Ed. p. 509.] which never occurs in other parts of the Old High German Grammar,* then the assumption becomes necessary that dēr, dēs, dēmu, dēn, have had their origin from older forms, as dyar, dyas (= त्यस tyas, त्यस्य tyasya), so that, as very frequently happens in Gothic (§. 72.), in the syllable ya the a is dropped, and the y changed into a vowel; just as, above, we have seen si and thi spring from sya thiuya. The Old High German, however, as is well known, very commonly employs ḍ for the Gothic i.

* See Vocalismus, p. 247.
356. The distribution of forms with e and i (or y) and a following vowel is not fortuitous, but rests on an historical basis, so that the contraction to e occurs universally where the Sanskrit has a short a after \( \text{\textit{y}} \);* but the more full form is found only when a long \( \text{\textit{a}} \), or the diphthong \( \text{\textit{ae}} \), accompanies the Indian semivowel, though this circumstance does not, in every case, ensure the more complete form in Old High German; for in the genitive plural we find \( \text{\textit{dérō}} \) (masculine, feminine, and neuter), notwithstanding the Indian त्रेष्यम् \( \text{\textit{tyēṣhām}} \) in the masculine and neuter, and त्रासम् \( \text{\textit{tyāśām}} \) in the feminine; and in the dative, together with \( \text{\textit{diēm}} \)—according to Notker, \( \text{\textit{dien}} \)—we find, also, \( \text{\textit{dēm}} \) or \( \text{\textit{dēn}} \), and this, too, in most authorities. The neuter instrumental \( \text{\textit{diu}} \) is based on the instrumental \( \text{\textit{syd}} \), which may be supposed to exist in Zend, and where, therefore, we have, in like manner, the i or y retained with original long vowels following that letter. Compare

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>SINGULAR</strong></th>
<th><strong>PLURAL</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nominative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Sanskrit.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>syas,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accusative</strong></td>
<td>tyum,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dative</strong></td>
<td>tyasmdi,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Genitive</strong></td>
<td>tyasya,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>NEUTER</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nom. Acc.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instrumental</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The rest like the masculine.

* Respecting the neuter daz, see §. 356. Rem. 2.
† I cannot, however, quote this pronoun in Zend, except in the nominative plural masculine in combination with the relative, §. 62.
¹ The latter is the Vedic and Zend form, see §. 281. and §. 234. Note *.
² The latter the Zend form pre-supposed above.
PRONOUNS.

FEMININE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SINGULAR</th>
<th>PLURAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sanskrit</td>
<td>Old H. G.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominative, tyās, tyāsām, tyābhyas, tyābhyaśas</td>
<td>Old H. G.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accusative, tyām, diu, dio, dio</td>
<td>Old H. G.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dative, tyasyāi, dēru, dēm, dēro</td>
<td>Old H. G.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive, tyasyās, dēra, dio, dio</td>
<td>Old H. G.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"Remark 1.—I differ from Grimm, whom, §. 288. Rem. 5., I have followed, as I here give die, not diē, and in the feminine plural dio, not diē, in the genitive plural dēro, and in the genitive and dative singular dēra, dēru, without a circumflex; since the circumstance that theory, and the history of language, would lead us to expect a long vowel, does not appear sufficient ground for the inference that the original long quantity, which has been retained in Gothic, was not shortened in the three centuries and a half which elapsed between Ulfilas and the oldest High German authorities. Where a long vowel is not shewn by Kero’s doubling the vowel, or Notker’s accenting it with a circumflex, which is not the case in the examples before us, we have there to assume that the vowel, in the course [G. Ed. p. 511.] of centuries, has undergone a weakening change. To this, final vowels are, for the most part, subject; hence, also, the subjunctive present preserves the ē, which corresponds to the Sanskrit Ṛ ē and Gothic ai only in persons in which the vowel is protected by a personal termination following it; but in the first and third persons singular, which have lost the personal signs, the organic length of quantity is also lost.*

"Remark 2.—It is very probable that the simple base

---

3 See §. 354.

* Grimm appears to have committed a mistake in referring, I. 723., to the third p. conj. for support of the supposed length of the e in the nominative plural, as at p. 868 he ascribes to it a short e.
\( \text{ta}, \) was, in Old High German, originally more fully declined, and that remains of that declension still exist. The neuter \( \text{daz} \) has the strongest claim to be viewed as such, which, contrary to §. 288. Rem. 5., I now prefer referring to the Sanskrit \( \text{tat} \), rather than to \( \text{tyat} \), as the syllable \( \text{t}ya \) has elsewhere, in Old High German, universally become \( \text{dē} \) (§. 271.). Perhaps, too, the \( \text{de} \) which occurs in the nominative plural masculine, together with \( \text{die} \) (Grimm. I. 791.), is not an abbreviation of the latter by the rejection of the \( i \), but a remnant of the simple pronoun, and therefore akin to the Sanskrit \( \text{ṇē tē} \) and Gothic \( \text{thai} \). On the other hand, in Old Sclavonic, in the declension of the simple pronoun given at §. 349., several remains of the compound \( \text{्त} \text{tya} \) have become intermingled, which are there explained. But the forms \( \text{to̱, toe, taya} \), which occur in the nominative and accusative, together with \( t′ \) (masculine), \( tō \) (neuter), \( ta \) (feminine), though they contain the same elements as the Sanskrit \( \text{्त} \text{tya} \), \( ता tyād, \) were first formed in Sclavonic, in the sense of §. 284., otherwise they would not have restored the vowel of the first pronoun, which the Sanskrit has suppressed (§. 353.); thus, \( ti \) for \( to̱, \) \( te \) or \( tye \) for \( toe \), and \( tyə \) for \( taya \) (compare §. 282.). The same is the case with the compound plural forms of the nominative and accusative; masculine \( 秣i, \) neuter \( taya, \) feminine \( tyya \).

"Remark 3.—In §. 160. I have made the assertion that the German dative is based on the old instrumental, as it often occurs with an instrumental signification. I was, however, particularly impelled to this view by the dative form of bases in \( i \), as \( \text{gasta} \) from the theme \( \text{gasti} \). But if we make the division \( \text{gast-a} \) and regard the \( a \) as the case-termination, there is nothing left us but [G. Ed. p. 512.] to refer this form to the Indo-Zend instrumental. There is, however, a way of comparing this form with the Sanskrit dative, which I now far prefer, as the Lithuanian and Sclavonic, which are so near akin to the German, have retained the
PRONOUNS.

dative, together with the instrumental; and the Old High German has preserved a particular form for the instrumental, the generic difference of which from the dative is especially observable in the pronoun, in which *dēmu* answers to *tyasmāi*; but the instrumental *diu*, and the Gothic *θē* (§ 159.), no more exhibit the appended pronoun *smu*, mentioned in § 165. &c., than does the Sanskrit-Zend instrumental. *Diu* agrees best with the Zend *thyā*, supposed above, and the Gothic *θē* with the simple *ti.* * The form *dēmu*, and the Gothic *thamma*, compared with *tyasmāi* and *tasmsāi*, have lost the *i* element of the Sanskrit diphthong *े di* (*=d + i*); and the long *a* has been shortened in Gothic, otherwise it would have been supplied by *ő* or *ē*.† The short Gothic *a* has, however, in Old High German, been still further weakened to *u*. But to return to the Gothic *gasta* from the theme *gasti*; I do not now regard the final *a* of this word as a case-suffix, but as a Guna-vowel, after which the *i* of the base has been dropped, together with the case-character, while all bases in *u*, and feminine bases in *i*, have lost only the inflexion, and not a portion of the base with it. The same relation that *sunau* has to the dative सूना सूनाव-े, from सूनु—which in Sanskrit also receives the Guna—the feminine *anstui*, from the theme *ansti*, has to the Sanskrit *mutay-े*, from *mati*. The masculine *gasta*, however, has not only lost the inflexion of *gastay-े*, as it must originally have been pronounced, but also the *y*, which ought to have reverted to *i*. In the *a*-declension *vulfa* is readily made to accord with the Sanskrit वृकाय *vrikāya*, and Zend *wāvā vēhrkāi*: to the latter it bears the same relation that *thamma* above does to *tasmsāi*. The feminine *gibai*, from the theme *gibā*, is as easily de-

---

* The Sanskrit *tyā-n-a* has, according to § 158., a euphonic *n* inserted, and the *a* of the base changed into *ē* by the blending of an *i*.
† The latter actually takes place in *hvammē-h*, *hvaryammē-h*. 
rivable, in regard to form, from the dative जिहवाय jihway-ai, as from the instrumental जिहवय jihway-ा. In both ways the inflexion has been lost, and the semivowel preceding it changed to a vowel. But if we are to believe [G. Ed. p. 613.] that a genuine dative character is retained in German, we should find it only in the declension of the pronouns, inasmuch as, for instance, the feminine form zai, in thi-zai, is directly derivable from the Sanskrit syāi, from smy-āi, by merely dropping the semivowel; so that thizai and तस्य tasyāi stand historically near to one another, as we have represented in §. 172., where we expressed our belief that ai, in thizai, may be explained on the same principle as that of gibai; and thus thizai must be considered as an abbreviation of thizay-ai, and, therefore, as indeclinable. But if thizai stands for thizy-ai, and ai is, therefore, in this and similar pronominal forms, a remnant of the Sanskrit feminine dative termination दि, then the Gothic ai above mentioned is essentially distinguished from the similar termination in gibai, "dono," and anstai, "gratiae," as these two, also, are diverse from one another, since the i of anstai belongs to the theme ansti, while an i is foreign to the theme of gibai, viz. gibā, and accompanies the base in the dative only: while in the corresponding class of words in Sanskrit it is added in several cases, after which is annexed the true inflexion, which is omitted in Gothic. But if the ai of thizai is identical with the Sanskrit दि of तस्य tasyāi, then we must distribute the genitive thizās into thi-z-ās, and this must be considered as an abbreviation of thi-zy-ās = Skr. तस्याः ta-sy-ās; and we should have in this, and similar pronominal forms,* a feminine genitive termination ās, while elsewhere in all genders the genitive sign consists in a mere s.

357. It has been already remarked, that our dieser is a com-

* To these belong the (strong) adjectives combined with a pronoun.
Pound pronoun (§ 288. Rem. 5. p. 370.), the first member of which is founded on the Sanskrit base त्या, and our article (§ 353.). It is not, however, requisite to assume that its ie presupposes an older ia, but it may be regarded, and this now appears to me preferable, as the unorganic lengthening of the di-sēr of Notker. As regards the second part of this demonstrative, its declension might be assigned partly to the simple Sanskrit base स sa, partly to the compound स्या: to the latter evidently belongs the feminine nominative

[G. Ed. p. 514.] देसियु (= त्या स्या, diese, “this,”) and the neuter plural nominative of the same sound. But if the feminine accusative is देसा, not देसिया, and the masculine देसिय, not देसियान, or देसियेन, according to the analogy of देन (§ 356), then, instead of regarding these and other analogous forms as remains of the simple base स sa, सा सā, it may be assumed that the i (or य) has been dropped, as occurs in most cases of the declension of हिर्ति (theme हिर्तिया or हिर्तिया); so that in the plural, हिर्ता, हिर्तो, हिर्तुम, and in the dative singular हिर्ता, answer to the Gothic हारिद्योς, हारिद्ये, हारिद्याम, हारिद्या. If this is, as I believe it is, the proper view of the declension of देसिय, the declensional difference between देसि and सेि then lies in this, that it has been necessary to lighten the latter, owing to the incumbrance of the base of the article which is prefixed to it, and that, therefore, i is rejected; hence देसा, “hanc,” but without the article सिया, “eam.” It is remarkable that the Lithuanian presents us with what appears to be the transposed form of our compound दी-सेि. As such, at least, I regard the so-called emphatic demonstrative स्तित्स, in which the Sanskrit subjective, but compounded pronoun स्या स्या, occupies the first place, and the objective and simple त ta the second. The first t of स्तित्स, which I divide thus, स्तित-स, is, in my opinion, a remnant of the neuter case-sign त (§ 155.), and presupposes a Sanskrit स्ति त्या, which त्या would form in the neuter, if it was used in that gender.
It may be observed, that in Sanskrit, also, the neuter case-sign \( t \), at the beginning of compounds, is drawn into the theme, and \( \text{tat-putras} \), "his son," is used, not \( \text{ta-putras} \).

358. The \( s\)z (\( =sh \)) in the Lithuanian \( szis \) and \( sziltas \) is founded on the form assumed by the Sanskrit base in the Vedas under certain euphonic conditions (§. 55.), which change its \( s \) into \( \varphi \) \( sh \). For otherwise [G. Ed. p. 515.] the Lithuanian \( sz \) does not agree with the Sanskrit \( s \), but perhaps, among other letters, with \( \varphi \) \( sh \), e.g. in \( szesi = \text{খৃ} \text{ shaś} \), "six." With regard to the declension of \( szis \), it is to be remarked, that it exhibits several cases, in which the \( i \) of the base \( szia \), feminine \( szid \), has been rejected, or which belong—and this view is the one I prefer—to the simple pronominal base \( s \) \( sa \), feminine \( s \) \( sd \), which completes the compound \( szis \); as, p. 486, among the cases of the simple Slavonic base \( t \) \( y \), we have seen remains of the compound \( s \) \( ty\).

We here annex the complete declension of the Lithuanian pronoun under discussion, accompanied by the kindred form in Old Slavonic. We prefix * to the cases which belong to the simple base \( s \) \( sa \), as also to the Old Slavonic forms which do not strictly belong to this place, and regarding which reference is to be made to Rem. 1. which follows.

**SINGULAR.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><strong>Lithuanian.</strong></th>
<th><strong>Old Slav.</strong></th>
<th><strong>Feminine.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Masculine.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominative</td>
<td>( szis )</td>
<td>( sy' )</td>
<td>( szi ),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>( si ),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accusative</td>
<td>( szin )</td>
<td>( sy' )</td>
<td>( szen ),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*siny' *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental</td>
<td>*( szu ), ( szum ),</td>
<td>( sim )</td>
<td>( szë ),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( szim )</td>
<td></td>
<td>*syr' *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dative</td>
<td>( sziam )</td>
<td>( sem )</td>
<td>( szici ),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>( sei )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td>( szio )</td>
<td>( sego )</td>
<td>( szios ),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>( seya )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locative</td>
<td>( sziamë, szemë ),</td>
<td>( sem )</td>
<td>( szioye ),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( szimë )</td>
<td></td>
<td>( sei )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 The agreement with the Gothic \( sì \) (§. 353.), and, in Slavonic, the complete identity with it, should not be overlooked. With respect to the contraction of the Slavonic theme \( syo \), sometimes to \( sì \), at other times to \( se \), compare §. 282.
PRONOUNS.

DUAL.

MASCUILINE.  FEMININE.


Dative, sziem, I. D. sima, sziom, sima.
Genitive, *szū, seyd, szū, siū.

PLURAL.

Nominative, szie, si, szios, *siya.
Instrumental, szeis, simi, *szomis, simi.
Dative, sziems, sim, *szoms, sim.
Genitive, szū, sich, szū, zich.

NEUTER.

Nom. Acc. sg. . . . . se.
Nom. Acc. du. . . . . sū.

"Remark 1.—The composition of the Sclavonic base sya, which occurred in the ancient period of the language, and by which it is shewn to be identical with the Sanskrit ṣya, having been forgotten, it need not appear surprising that this base, which, in Sclavonic, passes as a simple one, should be again combined with the pronoun which forms the definite declension, and which, from the first, forms its last member; hence, in the nominative singular, together with sy is used also sū, and in the feminine with sī also siya (compare § 284.). In some cases the ancient compound only is used, e. g. in the feminine accusative singular only si-yu is used, not syū.

"Remark 2.—In the light of the Sclavonic modern comp-
this form is a contraction of $a + i$, as in so many other places. While, therefore, the feminine $siu$ is to be referred direct to the Sanskrit या $syā$, and is, as it were, its continuation, $sēr$ has been formed first in the German language, by combining the base $sa$, which has been retained in Gothic in the nominative of the article, with the defining element $i$ (from $ya$). Compare what has been before remarked (§. 288. Rem. 5.) regarding analogous adjective-nominatives, as $plintēr$ from $plinta-ir$. As a corroboration of this distribution it may be here further observed, that each of the elements $a$ and $i$, which are united in the $ē$ of $plintēr$, also occurs separately,* each having, on different occasions, divested itself of the other. Thus $plintur$ and $plintir$ may occur;—a clear proof that $plintēr$ has been contracted from $plinta-ir$; for diphthongs are frequently subject to abbreviations, in which one of the elements combined in them is lost; as, in the Gothic, $habā$, "I have," and $habam$, "we have," are used instead of $habai$, $habaim$, as is shewn by the analogy of the other persons and the Old High German $habōm$, $habēmōs$.† The Old High German furnishes examples of forms in which only the latter element of $ai$ is retained; as $ensti$, answering to the Gothic dative $anstai$ and genitive $anstais$. It is not surprising, therefore, that, in the nominative of the definite adjective, together with $ēr$ (≡$air$) $ar$ and $ir$ also occur. Of these three forms ($ēr$, $ar$, $ir$), the first appears to be the original, since it forms the best medium of comparison for the two others. But if $plintar$, from $plintas$, was the original form, the $a$ in this place could not have been preserved beyond the fourth century, not to mention the eighth and a still later period; as $a$ in polysyllabic words in Gothic before a final $s$, which has from the

* Graff, II. 346.
† Cf. Vocalismus, p. 203.

L L
first held this place, is regularly suppressed, or, after $y$, weakened to $i,*$ while $ai$ is retained before a final $s$; hence, in the second person singular, subjunctive $ais$, Old High German $ës$, answering to the Sanskrit एस (from $aïs$), Latin $ës$, $ds,$ and Greek $os$."

[G. Ed. p. 518.] 359. The Lithuanian szit-ta-$s$ has been mentioned above (§. 357.), which, with regard to its last portion, is identical with the Greek αιΤΟ-Σ, and with the Sanskrit एत $ëTA$ (§. 344.). But the demonstrative base य $tya$, also, which is formed of $ta+y$, occurs in Lithuanian at the end of a compound pronoun. As such I regard $patis$ ($pat$-$s$), "ipse," which I distribute thus, $pa$-$tis$: $tis$ stands, according to rule, for $tyis$ from $tyas$, as $yaunik$ $kis$, "bridegroom," for $yaunik$ $kyis$ from $yaunik$ $k$ $yas$ (§. 135.). But in Lithuanian, $t$ before two vowels, ie excepted, is changed into $cz$ (=ch);† hence dative $pa$-$czia-m$, locative $pacz$ $ia$-$më$, or $patime$, instrumental $pacziu$. In the genitive $paczi$ $o$ might be expected, according to the analogy of $szio$ and $yaunik$ $kio$ : we find, however, $patiës$, according to the analogy of $awiës$ (§. 193.); the feminine genitive $paczi$ $o$ $s$ agrees, however, with $szio$, and similar genitives from bases in a feminine $*$ $S\ A$. As regards the first member of $pa$-$tis$, I consider it to be identical with the Sanskrit base $swa$, $swë$, whence क्षयम $swayam$, "self." $Swa$ becomes $pa$ by the loss of the initial letter, and the hardening of the $v$ to $p$, as, in Prâkrit, पनि $pani$, "thou," proceeds from तन्म $twam$; so in the Bohemian or Gipsey language, $pën$, "sister," comes from $सस्र $ $swar$ (क्षरु $swari$). Indeed, in the pronoun under discussion, the Lithuanian admits of comparison with the Gipsey language, as in the latter, as has been already pointed out in

---

* It is to be observed that the $s$ of $vuls$, from $vulsas$, "lupi," is not an original final, as appears from the Sanskrit vrîka-sya and Greek λύκοσ.$\nu$.  
† Legás for legâis, Vocalismus, p. 201.  
† Written also $ch$, see p. 138, last line.
another place, *pe has been formed from स्वा swa, whence
pe-s, pe-n, “self,” the former as singular, the latter as plural
accusative.†

360. We turn to a pronominal base con-
sisting of a simple vowel, viz. i, which, in Latin and German,
expresses the idea “he,” and in Sanskrit and Zend signifies
“this,” and which has left, in those languages, no proper declen-
sion, but only adverbs; as इतस् itas, “from here,” “from
there,” and which supplies the place of the ablative after com-
paratives; इह iha, Z. इधा idha and इद्रिस् ithra, “here,” i. e.
“at this,” with an inherent notion of place; इत iti, Zend इत्या
itha, Latin ita, “so,” इत्यादित् idānīm, “now,” analogous with
tadānīm “then”; and also इत्ययम् it-tham, “so,” at the bottom
of which lies the obsolete neuter it as the theme,‡ and which
occurs in the Vēdas also, as an enclitic particle. I regard
this इत it as the last portion of चैत chēt “if” (from cha + it),
and नेत nēt, “if not” (from na + it) which latter is in Zend
नेत nēt (§. 33.), and merely means “not”; since, like our
German nicht, it has been forgotten that its initial element
alone is negative, while its latter portion signifies something
real—in Zend “this,” and in German “thing,” (ni-cht, from
ni-wiht, Gothic ni-vaihts). From the pronominal root i pro-
ceed, also, the derivatives इतरस् itara-s, “the other,” with
the comparative suffix; the accusative of which, itera-m,
coincides with the Latin iterum, इद्रिस् idriṣa, and similar
forms, which signify “such,” and इयम् iyat, “so many.”
Notwithstanding these numerous offshoots, which have sur-
vived the declension of the pronoun under discussion, its
base has been entirely overlooked by the Indian gramma-

† Perhaps, also, the syllable pen of bolapen, “heaven,” is identical with
the Sanskrit war of the same meaning.
‡ Compare what is said at §. 357. respecting the Lithuanian szit-tas.
rians; and I believe I am the first who brought it to light.*

The Indian grammarians, however, give extraordinary ety-

-[G. Ed. p. 520.]-ologies for some of the abovementioned words, and derive $i\ddot{u}$, “so,” from $i\ddot{u}$, “to go”; $i\ddot{a}ra$-$s$, “the other,” from $i$, “to wish” (see Wilson). In some, recourse is had to सः सम्म $i\ddot{a}m$, “this”; and one would not be entirely in error in deriving from this word $i\ddot{a}s$, “from here,” though there is a difficulty in seeing how from $i\ddot{a}m$ as the theme can spring the form $i\ddot{a}s$ by a suffix $\dot{a}s$. We should expect $i\ddot{a}ntas$ or $i\ddot{a}tas$.

361. In Latin the theme of $i$s is lengthened in several cases by an inorganic $u$ or $o$, in the feminine by $a$, and it is thus brought into the second and first declension, in which $i$ is liable to be corrupted to $e$, especially before vowels. As from the verbal root $i$, “to go,” come $e$-$o$ and $e$-$u$-$n$-$t$, in opposition to $i$s, $i$t, $i$m-$u$, $i$-$i$s, $i$-$a$m; so from our pronoun come $e$-$u$m, $e$-$o$, $e$-$o$-$r$-$u$m, $e$-$o$s, and the feminine forms $e$-$a$, $e$-$a$m, $e$-$a$-$e$, $e$-$a$-$r$-$u$m, all from the base which has been subsequently lengthened, to which the obsolete $e$-$a$-$b$-$u$s also belongs. To the old type belong only $i$s, $i$d, the obsolete forms $i$m-$i$, $i$b-$u$s, with which agree the Gothic $i$n-$a$, “him,” $i$-$m$, “to them,” (from $i$-$b$, §. 215.), and the genitive and dative $e$-$j$-$u$s, $e$-$i$, which are common to the three genders, and also the locative $i$b-$i$—in form a dative, according to the analogy of $t$-$i$b-$i$, $s$-$i$b-$i$ (§. 215.)—and probably the word $i$-$m$-$o$, which has been already mentioned (§. 351.), which we may suppose formerly to have been pronounced $i$-$m$-$o$, and which corresponds to the Sanskrit pronominal ablatives in संदत्, but by assimilation approaches very closely the Gothic dative $i$-$m$-$o$, “to him.” The dative $e$i stands isolated in Latin Grammar, inasmuch as all other bases in $i$ have permitted this vowel to be melted into one with the case-termination; thus $h$-$o$-$s$-$t$-$i$, from $h$-$o$-$s$-$t$i-$i$: the pronominal base $i$, however, escapes this

combination by being changed into e. In my Vocalismus (p. 204), I have derived the length of quantity in the dative character from the combination of the i of the theme with the i of the inflexion, which is properly short; and I have assumed that bases terminating in a consonant lengthen the base in the dative singular, as in most of the other cases, by an inorganic i; thus pedi from pedi-i. As, then, in this way a long i must be found almost universally in the dative, this would come to be regarded by the spirit of the language as the true sign of this case, and thus ei, and the whole fourth and fifth declensions, followed the prevailing example of the more numerous class of words. Cui alone retains the proper short quantity. It cannot be objected to the Latin language generally that it shews any undue inclination towards terminations with a long i, and thereby lengthens unnecessarily that letter when originally short; for universally where a long final i is found, there is also a reason for its length, as in the genitive singular and nominative plural of the second declension it is the suppression of the final vowel of the base, which has induced the lengthening of the termination as a compensation; thus lup-i, in both cases, for lupoi; while in the dative lupō for lupoi the termination has been merged in the vowel of the base. We have already mentioned (§. 349. p. 497 G. ed. Note 3) pronominal datives like isti for istoi, which would be analogous to the Greek μοι, σοι, σι. 

362. The Gothic pronominal base i has two points of superiority over the Latin base which has been just mentioned: in the first place it has never admitted the corruption of the original vowel to e, as generally this comparatively recent vowel is as completely foreign to the Gothic as to the Sanskrit; and secondly, the theme i in the masculine and neuter is preserved free from that inorganic admixture which transfers the Latin kindred form from the third to the second declension, and has
produced *eum* for *im*, *eo* for *e* or *i*, *ii* or *ei* for *ēs*, *eorum* for *ium*. The Gothic pronoun, by the side of which are given in parentheses the forms, which have been most probably [G. Ed. p. 522.] drawn from the corresponding Sanskrit base at the time when it was declined, are as follows:—

### Masculine.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nominative, <em>i-s</em></td>
<td><em>i-s</em></td>
<td>(ay-as),</td>
<td><em>ei-s</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accusative, <em>i-na</em></td>
<td><em>i-n</em></td>
<td>(i-n),</td>
<td><em>i-ns</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dative, <em>i-m</em></td>
<td>(i-shmiddi)?</td>
<td><em>i-m</em>,</td>
<td>(i-shyas),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive, <em>i-s</em></td>
<td>(i-shyaa)?</td>
<td>(i-sham),</td>
<td><em>i-ze</em>.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Neuter.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sanskrit.</th>
<th>Gothic.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nom. Acc.</td>
<td><em>i-t</em>,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 This form actually occurs in the Védas, see Rosen’s Specimen p. 10, and Note p. 11. We should have anticipated *im* (with short *i*), according to the common declension; but the substantive and adjective declension has no monosyllabic bases in *i*, and other monosyllabic bases—with the exception of those in *ō*—use *am* as their termination; hence *bhiy-am* for *bhi-m*; and so, also, *iy-am* might be expected from *i*, as in monosyllabic words both short and long *i* are changed before vowels into *iy*. The Vëda dialect in the foregoing case, however, has preferred strengthening the vowel of the base to an extension of the termination, or, which is more probable, it has contracted an existing *iyam* to *im*, according to the analogy of the Zend (§. 42.); and thus, perhaps, also the Vëdic *im*, “*eam,*” cited by Rosen l. c., is a contraction of *syām*, otherwise we must assume, that instead of the feminine base *sā* mentioned in §. 345., *si* occurred, according to the analogy of the Zend *hūti* from *hma* (§. 172.). It is certainly remarkable that the *s*, which is especially subjective, has here found its way into the accusative, like the Old High German *sia* and Old Latin *sam*, “*eam,*” *sum*, “*eum*” (§. 345.).

2 Comp. *amu-shmiddi*, from *amu*, and §. 21.

3 Compare *amu-shyaa*, from *amu*, whence it appears that all pronouns, with whatsoever vowel their theme ends, have, in the genitive, *syaa*, or, euphonically, *shya* (§. 21).

4 §. 157.

5 §. 233.
Although in Gothic, as in Sanskrit, as in Zend, Greek, and Latin, the vowel i in substantives is appropriated equally well to the feminine theme-termination as to the masculine; still in our pronoun of the third person, where the idea is essentially based on the distinction of sex, so that that which signifies "he" cannot mean "she," the necessity for this distinction has produced an extension of the base i, in cases which, without such an extension, would be fully identical with the masculine.* In the nominative singular a totally different pronoun is employed, which, in High German, is used throughout all those cases which are formed in Gothic from the extended base: Gothic si, Old High German siu, &c. (§. 354.). The affix which is used in Gothic to extend the base consists in the vowel which, from a time far prior to the formation of the German language, was especially employed as the fulcrum of feminine bases, but which in Gothic appears in the form of š instead of ù (§. 69.); thus, iyō from i+š, with the euphonic change of the i to iy, as in the plural neuter forms iy-a, thriy-a, (§. 233.). From the base iyō is formed however, in the uninflected accusative—as final vowels are for the most part liable to abbreviation—iya, an analogous form to the in like manner shortened Latin ea, eam (for ia, iam), and in the nominative and accusative plural iyōs.† In the dative plural the identity with the masculine and neuter is not avoided, and this case is, as from [G. Ed. p. 524.] the Old High German might be conjectured, im, with

* The accusative singular would, indeed, be distinguished from the masculine, since the feminine has completely lost the accusative character; but it was there originally, and therefore the necessity for a mark of distinction from the masculine also existed.

† The accusative alone occurs, yet it is probable that the nominative was exactly the same (Grimm. I. 785), in case it did not come from the same base as the singular nominative, and it would, therefore, be syōs.
PRONOUNS.

regard to which we must observe, that in Latin, also, in several of the oblique cases, the distinction of gender is less attended to (ejus, ei, old eae). All the cases which distinguish the feminine by the inflexion spring from the original theme; thus i-zōs, i-zai, genitive plural izā, opposed to is, imma, izē. In Latin, also, the extension of the base i may have been commenced in the feminine, and thus an analogous masculine eum have been made to correspond to eam, and may have superseded the more ancient im. Similar corruptions have been adopted by the language in the other cases; thus eorum placed itself beside earum, and thus the ium, which probably existed, fell into disuse: eabus, iis, eis, were followed by the masculine and neuter iis, eis, which supplanted the older ibus.

364. If the singular nominative of the reflective pronoun given by the old grammarians was ḯ and not ṭ, it might be regarded as the kindred form of the pronoun under discussion; and in this view it would be of importance that the Vēdic accusative ṭm, mentioned above (p. 510, Note 1.), has a reflective meaning in the passage quoted, and is rendered by Rosen "semet ipsum." But if ṭ is the right form, then it probably belongs to the Sanskrit base* swa, swē, whence swayam, "self" (§. 341.), and is connected with oō, oï, ṭ, and υφeis, &c., the latter from the base ΣΦΙ. As in this word an i stands for an original α, which would lead us to expect

[G. Ed. p. 525.] o, so also in ṭ; and it deserves notice, that so early as the Sanskrit, together with swa is found a weakened form swi, from which I think may be formed the interrogative

* Not necessarily so, as the rough breathing occurs also in words which originally begin with a pure vowel, as ἖κθέροσ, answering to श्यातारस ekatara-s. On the other hand the form ṭ would not peremptorily conduct us to a base ढ i, as initial s has sometimes been entirely lost in Greek.
particle विन्तम् swit, as neuter, and analogous to तत् it and विन्तम् chit. In favour of the opinion that त belongs to the old reflective base, may be adduced the circumstance, that, like the two other pronouns in which there is no distinction of gender (ैव, ृण), it is without a nominative sign. If it belonged to the base त i, it would most probably have had the same sound as the Latino-Gothic is, unless we prefer regarding त as the neuter. The dative तू, from its termination, falls under the pronouns devoid of gender (§. 222.), and would, therefore, likewise belong to the reflective base. The accusative तव, however, considered independently, would not furnish any objection to the opinion that it is identical with the Latin in and the Gothic ina.*

365. We have already mentioned the inseparable demonstrative त (§. 157.). There is, however (and this creates a difficulty), another mode of derivation, according to which that त would be identical with the ei (=ै), which is attached in Gothic, in a similar manner, to other pronouns, not to strengthen their demonstrative meaning, but to give them a relative signification: ै, from is + ei, means "qui," and ै, a contraction of si + ei, in accordance with a law of sound universally followed in Sanskrit (Gram. Crit. §. 35.) signifies "quae." It is most frequently combined with the article; saei, soei, thatei, "qui," "quae," "quod"; thizei, feminine thizōzei, "cujus"; and so through all the cases; only in the feminine genitive plural thizōei has as yet not been found to occur (Grimm. III. 15.). If the first or second person is referred to, ei is attached [G. Ed. p. 526.] to त and तू: thus ै, thuei; for the Gothic relative requires that the person to which it refers should be incorporated with it; and as it is itself indeclinable, the relations of case are denoted by the pronoun preceding it, which is

* Compare Hartung on the Cases, p. 116; M. Schmidt De Pron., p. 12, &c.; Kühner, p. 385.
then merged in the meaning of its attendant. Alone, *ei* signifies "that," like the Latin *quod* and the Sanskrit relative neuter यत yat. And I have no doubt that the Gothic *ei*, in its origin, belongs to the Sanskrit-Zend relative base *ya*, which in Gothic has become *ei*, just as, in many other parts of Gothic Grammar, *ei* (=*) answers to the Sanskrit *ya*, as in the nominative singular *hairdeis* from the base *hairdy*a.* With respect to form, therefore, the derivation of the Gothic *ei* from the Sanskrit य या, admits of no doubt; and since the signification of the two words are identical, we must rest satisfied with this mode of deducing it, and abandon Grimm's conjecture that *ei* is intimately connected with *is*, "he," or only allow it a very distant relationship to it, in as far as the derivation of the Sanskrit relative base *ya*, from the demonstrative base *i*, is admitted. The relationship, however, of these two is not susceptible of proof; for as *sa*, *ta*, *ma*, *na*, are simple primary bases, why should not such a one have originated in the semi-vowel *y* also? But if the Greek demonstrative *f* is akin to the Gothic appended pronoun of similar sound, it likewise would proceed from the Sanskrit relative base, which appears to be especially destined for combination with other pronouns (see §. 353.); and this disposition is especially observable in Sclovonic, in which language that base, when isolated, has laid aside the relative

[G. Ed. p. 527.] signification (§. 282.). Hence, before entering deeply into the Sclovonic system of declension, I mistook this base, and thought I saw in its abbreviation to *i* (*i* "eum," *im*, "*ei"*) the Sanskrit base *i*.

366. We return to the Sanskrit *idam*, "this," in order to notice the bases from which its declension is completed, and of which each is used only in certain cases. The most simple, and the one most largely employed, is अ *a*, whence *a-smdi*, "huic," *a-smdt*, "hoc," *a-smin*, "in hoc," in

the dual ā-bhyām, and in the plural ē-bhis—analogous to Vedic forms like aśvē-bhīs from aśvā (§. 219.)—ē-bhyas, ē-sādām, ē-śhu, exactly like tē-bhīyas, &c., from ta, viz. by the con-
mingling of an i, as is usual in the common declension in many cases. There is no necessity, therefore, to have recourse to a distinct base ē, but this is only a phonetic
lengthening of a, and from it comes also the masculine
nominative स्वयम् ayam from ē + am, as स्वयम् swayam, “self.”
from śvē (for śva) + am (§. 341.). Max. Schmidt is disposed
to compare with this ē the Latin e of eum, ea, &c. (l. c. p. 10),
and to regard the latter as an abbreviation of an origi-
nally long e; for support of which opinion he relies prin-
cipally on the form aeī, in an inscription to be found in
Orelli, and on the circumstance that, in the older poets,
the dative ei has a long e. But we do not think it right
to infer from this dative that every e of the pronoun is
is originally long; and we adhere to the opinion ex-
pressed at §. 361., which is, moreover, confirmed by the
circumstance that i also occurs before vowels; and even
in the plural ii, iis, is more common than ei, eis. As re-
gards, however, the obsolete dative singular with a long e,
it may be looked upon as the Guna form of i; as i in Sans-
rkrit, according to the common declension, would form
aY-ē = ē + ē. From this ē, however, which is formed by
Guna from i, that which we have seen [G. Ed. p. 528.]
formed from a by the addition of an i is different; and there-
fore the Latin dative, even if it had an originally long e,
would still have nothing in common with Sanskrit forms like
ē-bhis, &c. The e in the genitive ejus is long through the
euphonic influence of the j, and for it occurs, also, the form
aeius, in an inscription given by Orelli (N. 2866.) When,
through the influence of a j, the preceding vowel is long, it
should not be termed long by position:* j is not a double

* The length of the vowel preceding the j may sometimes be differently
accounted
consonant, but the weakest of all simple consonants, and approximates in its nature closely to that of a vowel. This weakness may have occasioned the lengthening of the preceding vowel, in remarkable coincidence with the Sanskrit, in which i and u, where they stand before a suffix commencing with य y are always either lengthened or strengthened by the addition of a t: hence the roots जि ji and स्तु stu form, in the passive, जिये jiye, स्तुये stuye, but in the gerund in ya, jitya, stutya.* The case is different where ह i or ह i in monosyllabic forms are changed, before a vowel following them, into ह i: the y which arises from i, i, has no lengthening power. It is scarcely possible to give any decided explanation of the orthographical doubling of the i for j in Latin. When Cicero wrote Maiia, aiiio, he may have pronounced these words [G. Ed. p. 529.] as Mai-ja, ai-jo (Schneider, p. 281); and we cannot hence infer that every initial j was described in writing by ii. If this were the case, we should be compelled to the conclusion, that by doubling the i the distinguishing the semi-vowel from the vowel i was intended, as, in Zend, the medial y is expressed by double i (ii); and as double u denotes, in Old German, the w, though a single u, especially after initial consonants, occurs as the representative of w. But if Cicero meant a double j by his double i, it would not follow that, in all cases, the language intended the same. The Indian grammarians admit the doubling of a consonant after r, as sarppa for sarpa, “snake,” and accounted for; as major (§.301.) has been derived from magior, where the vowel may have been lengthened owing to the g being dropped. And a consonant must originally have preceded even the j of the genitive in jus, if this termination is akin to the feminine Sanskrit स्माः svas (§.349. Note 22).

* Compare what has been said in my Vocalismus, p.213, regarding the tendency of the i to be preceded by a long vowel.
they admit, also, of many other still more extraordinary accumulations of consonants, with which the language cannot be actually encumbered. But if the doubling of a consonant following \( r \) had any real foundation, the \( r \) would be assimilated to the consonant which followed it—as, in the Prākrit, savva from sarva,—and then the simultaneous continuation of the \( r \) in writing would only be in order to retain the recollection of its originally having existed.*

367. From the demonstrative base ए a, mentioned in the preceding paragraph, a feminine base ए might have arisen (see §. 172.), whence, by the addition of the termination am, so common in pronouns, the nominative singular इयं iyam (euphonic for ए-am, Gram. Crit. §. 51.) may be derived. As, however, a short i with am [G. Ed. p. 530.] might become इयं iyam, it is uncertain if the feminine of our pronoun should be referred to the masculine base a, or to i: the former, however, appears to me the more probable, since thus the masculine nominative एयं ayam, and its feminine इयं iyam, would be of the same origin, while the base \( i \) does not occur uncompounded in the whole masculine and neuter declension. The Gothic iy₃, "eum," cannot, therefore, be compared with इयं iyam, particularly as, in §. 363., we have seen the Gothic arrive, in a way peculiar to itself, but still in accordance with the Latin, at a theme iy₃ lengthened from i; but the am of the Sanskrit iyam is merely the nominative termination.

368. In Zend एयं ayam becomes एम aём (§. 42.), and इयं iyam becomes इम im. The neuter इदम idam, however, is replaced by इम idam, from the base ima, which, in Sanskrit, is one of those which supply the declension of idam. Hence, for example, come the accusative masculine इम imam, feminine इमाम imām, Zend इम इम, Zend एम aём, Zend इम इम, Zend इम इम.

* Compare the assimilation of \( m \), and its simultaneous graphical representation by \( \) (Gram. Crit. §. 70.)
PRONOUNS.

Ought we, then, to compare with it the Old Latin *emem* for *eundem*, or, with Max. Schmidt (l. c. p. 11), consider it as the doubling of *em* for *im*? It need not seem surprising that the base *ima,* which, in the singular, occurs only in the accusative, and which is principally limited to this case, should be found in Latin in the accusative only. I regard *ima* as the union of two pronominal bases, viz. *i* and *ma* (§. 105.): the latter does not occur in Sanskrit uncompounded, but is most probably connected with the Greek *μι*, and the latter, therefore, with the Old Latin *emem*.

[G. Ed. p. 531.] 369. As *i* with *ma* has formed the combination *ima*, in like manner I regard the base चन *ana*, which likewise enters into the declension of *idam* as the combination of च a with another demonstrative base, which does not occur in Sanskrit and Zend in isolated use, but, doubtless, in Pāli, in several oblique cases of the three genders,† in the plural also in the nominative, and in that of the neuter singular, which, like the masculine accusative, is न *naṅ.* Clough gives the cases in which this pronom occurs as secondary forms to the base यत *ta*, as, in Sanskrit, in several cases, a pronoun is found with the compound यत *etā*, which has *na* instead of *ta* for its last portion.§ We will here give the compound Sanskrit pronoun over against the Pāli simple pronoun.

* In the pl. the nom. (इमः *imē*) belongs to this base, and in the dual इमः *imāu*, is both nom. and accusative.
† In the feminine naturally produced to *ndā*, the *d* of which, however, is shortened in the accusative न *naṅ* "eam."
‡ I write *naṅ*, not *nam*, as a final *m* in Pāli, as in Prākṛt, becomes an anuswāra, which is pronounced like a stifled *n* (§§. 9, 10.). The original *m* in Pāli has been retained only before initial sounds commencing with a vowel (Burnouf and Lassen, pp. 81, 82). Final *n* is likewise corrupted in Pāli to anuswāra, or is lost entirely.
§ In Zend observe the feminine genitive अनुनादः *anunāḍa* (कः *kha*, Vend. S. p. 47), which presupposes a Sanskrit नन्या।
## PRONOUNS.

### MASCULINE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N. csha,</td>
<td>sō,</td>
<td>étē,</td>
<td>tē, nē,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ac. étam, enam,</td>
<td>tui, nai,</td>
<td>étan, enān,</td>
<td>tē, nē,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. étēna, ēnēna,</td>
<td>tēna, nēna,</td>
<td>étāis,</td>
<td>(tēbhi, nēbhi,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. étasmāi.</td>
<td>1 . . .</td>
<td>ētēbhyaś,</td>
<td>1 . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ab. étasmāt,</td>
<td>(tasmā, nasmā,</td>
<td>ētēbhyaś,</td>
<td>like Instr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. étasya,</td>
<td>tassā, nassa,</td>
<td>étēshām,</td>
<td>tēsāi, nēsāi,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. étasmin,</td>
<td>(tasmin, nasmīn,</td>
<td>ētēshū,</td>
<td>tēsu, nēsu.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(or tamhi, namha,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>or tamhi, namhi,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### NEUTER.

| N. ētāt,  | tān, nān, | étāni, | tāni, nānī. |
| Ac. état, enat, | tān, nān, | étāni, ēnāni | (tāni, nānī, |
|           |           | (or tē, nē. |

The rest like the masculine.

### FEMININE.

| N. ēyā, | sā, | ētās, | (tā, nā, |
| Ac. ētām, enām, | tān, nān, | ētās, ēnās, | (or tāyā, nāyā. |
| I. ētāya, ēnayā, tāya, nāya, | ētábhīṣ, | (tābhi, nābhī, |
| D. étasyāi, | 1 . . . | ētábhyaś, | 1 . . . |
| Ab. étasyās, | tassā, tissā, | ētábhyaś, | like the Instr. |
| G. étasyās, | tassā, tissā, | ētáśāṃ, | tāsāi, tāsānāi, |
| L. étasyām, | tassāi, tissāi, | ētásu, | tāsu. |

1 Is replaced by the genitive. 2 Or tēsānāi, [G. Ed. p. 583.] nēsānāi, as the old genitive is taken as theme, after suppressing the nasal, and from it a new one is formed according to the analogy of the common declension

3 Observe the transposition of the long vowel. 4 In the form tissā
the Pali coincides in a remarkable manner with the Gothic thizòs, since, like it, it has weakened the old a to i. Tissèd, however, is inferior to the Gothic kindred form, in having dropped the final s; and in this point ranks with the Old High German, in which the Gothic zòs has become ra (p. 510. G. ed.). The Pali, however, has abandoned all final s, without exception. The older form tassèd (by assimilation from tasyèd), which is not given by Clough, is supplied by Burnouf and Lassen, with whom, however, the form tissèd is wanting, though they furnish an analogous one, viz. inissèd (Essai, p. 117). Clough gives, moreover, the forms tissèdya and tassàtìya. The former, like the plural genitive, appears to be formed by the addition of a new genitive form, according to the common declension, to the pronominal genitive form. From the form tassàtìya we might be led to an obsolete ablative, which, in Sanskrit, must have been tasyèdt—still earlier tasmyèdt—which is proved by Zend forms like avanhdt, “ex hae” (§ 180. p. 198 last line). But if we are to give to tassàtìya not an ablative sense, but a genitive and dative one, I then prefer dividing it thus: tassèd-tìya, so that the feminine base tà would be contained in it twice—once with the pronominal, and again with the common genitive termination. But it is probable that the form imamitàd, which is given by Burnouf and Lassen (Essai, p. 117) as an anomalous feminine instrumental, is originally an ablative; for this case, in its significations, borders on the instrumental, and to it belongs the appended pronoun sma. But if imamitàd is an ablative, it is, in one respect, more perfect than the Zend forms, like əmaax avanhdt, since the Pali form has retained also the m of the appended pronoun sma—transposed to mìna,—while the n of əmaax avanhdt is only an euphonic affix (§ 56*.) The final t, however, in Pali, must, according to a universal law of sound, be removed, as in the masculine; and thus the ablative nature of imamitàd might the more easily lie hid before the discovery of the Zend form.

370. I have already, in my review of Forster’s Grammar,* and before I became acquainted, through the Pali, with the isolated pronoun, considered the Latin conjunction nam as

[ G. Ed. p. 534.] an accusative to be classed here; and I have there also represented the Sanskrit èna as a compound, and compared the Latin enim with its accusative एनम् ènam. It will, however, be better to refer enim, as also nam, to the

feminine accusative—P. न nan, Sans. राम् नाम—as the short masculine a in Latin has elsewhere become u, among other words, in nunc, i.e. "at this (time)," which (l.c.) I have explained like tunc, as analogous to hunc. But if tunc and nunc are not accusatives, their nc would appear to be akin to the Greek νίκα, and tunc might be compared to τηννίκα, of which more hereafter. With respect to nam and enim, we may refer to §. 351. with regard to the possibility, in similar pronominal formations, of their m being a remnant of the appended pronominal forms. There is no doubt, however, of the pronominal derivation of all these adverbs. We may remark, in this respect, our German denn, and the Latin quip-pe from quid-pe, to which, with regard to its last syllable, nempe from nam-pe (compare §. 6.) is analogous. The Sanskrit किन्च, "moreover" (eu-phonics for kinccha), may be regarded as the prototype of quippe, for it consists of kim, "what?" and cha (commonly "and"), which takes from it the interrogative meaning, and is in form the same as que, which also, in quisque, removes the interrogative signification of the pronoun. The syllable pe, however, of quippe, is, in its origin, identical with que, and has the same relation to it that the Æolic πέμπε has to quinque. As regards the relation of the i of enim to the a of nam, we may refer to that of contingo to tango, and similar phenomena, as also to the Pāli tissā together with tassā (see Table, §. 369.). [G. Ed. p. 535.]

The Greek νίκ, like μίκ, has a weakened vowel, which appears also in the Sanskrit inseparable preposition ni, "down," whence has arisen our German nieder, Old High German ni-dar (p. 382), which bears the same relation to na that the neuter interrogative kim has to the masculine kas. A u also, in analogy with कुतस् ku-tas, "whence?" कुच ku-tra, "where?" has been developed in our demonstrative, and appears in the interrogative particle नु nu, with which we compare the Latin num, and the Greek νό, which, in form, and partly in use, is identical with नु nu.* On the other hand, in

* Compare Hartung, Greek Particles, 11.99.
nuv, nun, “now,” which likewise belongs to the base na or nu, the original demonstrative signification is retained more truly. Are we to suppose in the ν of this word, as being a necessary corruption of final μ, a remnant of the appended pronoun sμa, and that the vowel preceding has been lengthened in compensation for the loss of the rest? Then νωv would perhaps admit of comparison with the Pali locative nasmin, or namhi, and the change of α to ν would have first taken place in Greek through the influence of the liquids, as σωv answers to the Sanskrit सन sam, “with.” Our nun, Gothic nu, is likewise related, as is also noch, as analogous to doch. The Gothic forms are nauh, thauh, to the final particle of which, uh, we shall recur hereafter.

371. The Sanskrit negative particle न na, which appears in Gothic in the weakened form ni, comes next to be considered: in Old Scavonic it is ne, ni, the latter only as a prefix.* So it is ni in Lithuanian, in niekas, “none,” (ni-ékas, compare Sanskrit ēkas, “one,”) and kindred compounds; but elsewhere it is found as ne: in Greek it is lengthened to νη, but only at the beginning of compounds, as νικερως, νηκηδής:

[G. Ed. p. 536.] in Latin it is found only as a prefix† in the form of nē, nī, nē, nī (nēfas, nefandum, neque, nisi, nimirum). This negative particle occurs in the Vēdas with the signification sicut, which points at its pronominal derivation.‡ At least I think that we cannot assume a different origin for the particle in the two significations which are apparently so distinct: for if the idea ya, “yes,” is denoted by a pronominal expression—in Latin by i-ta, in Sanskrit by ta-thā, in Gothic by yai, of which hereafter—its opposite may be contrasted with it, as “that” to “this,” and न na would therefore,

* See Kopitar’s Glagolita, p. 77.
† I regard the conjunction nē as a corruption of mē = μη, मा mā, as narro, probably, from marro (see Vocalismus, p. 165.)
as "that," simply direct to what is distant; for to say that a
quality or thing does not belong to an individual, is not to re-
move it entirely, or to deny its existence, but to take it away
from the vicinity, from the individuality of a person, or to place
the person on the other side of the quality or thing designated,
and represent it as somewhat "other," than the person. But
that which, in Sanskrit, signifies "this," means also, for the
most part, "that," the mind supplying the place, whether near or
remote, and the idea of personality alone is actually expressed
by the pronouns. The inseparable negative particle अ a, too
—in Greek the α privative—is identical with a demonstrative
base (§. 366.), and the prohibitive particle ना ma=μη belongs
to the base ma, (§. 368.), and the Greek negation οὐ admits of
being compared with a demonstrative, as will be shewn here-
after. Observe, further, that as न na in the Vêdas unites the
relative meaning "as" with the negative, so the correspond-
ing ne in Latin appears both as interrogative and negative; in the former sense affixed, in the latter
prefixed. It is further to be observed of the Sanskrit ना, that when combined with itself, but both times lengthened—
thus नाना nānd—it signifies "much," "of many kinds," as it were, "this and that"; as totus also has been formed by reduplication (§. 351.). The Sanskrit expression, however, is
indeclinable, and is found only in the beginning of com-
 pounds. We may here mention, also, the interrogative and
asseverative particle नूनम् nānam, which I agree with
Hartung (l. c. II. 95.) in distributing into nū-nam, since I re-
gard nū as the lengthened form of the nu mentioned above,
without, however, comparing nam with नामन् nāman,
"name," as the pronominal base na appears to me to be
sufficient for the explanation of this Indian nam, as well as
that in Latin; which latter, likewise, Hartung endeavours to
compare with नामन् nāman, "name."

372. We return to the compound अना ana, the last element
of which has been considered by us in §. 369. From ana
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comes, in Sanskrit, the instrumental masculine and neuter अनेन anēna, Zend मु म ana (§. 158.), feminine अनया anayā, Slavonic onoyā (§. 266.), and the genitive and locative dual of the three genders anayōs, which, in Slavonic, has become onā for onoyā (§. 273.). In Lithuanian, anu-s, or an’-s, feminine ana, signifies "that," and, like the Slavonic on, ona, ono, of the same signification, is fully declined, according to the analogy of tas, tā, t’, ta, to,* being, in this respect, superior to the corresponding words in Sanskrit and Zend. To this pronoun belong the Latin and Greek an, āv, as also the Gothic interrogative particle an (Grimm. III. 756.), though elsewhere in the three sister languages the n is thematic; which is especially evident in Gothic, where, from a theme ana in the accusative masculine, only an could be formed,

[G. Ed. p. 598.] and the same in the neuter or anata. For the Greek and Latin we should assume that अन anā had lost its final vowel, as we have before seen रन ēna abbreviated to 'EN (§. 308.). But if the n belonged to the inflection, or to the appended pronoun स्म śma, which appears to me less probable, then the simple base अ a (§. 366.) would suffice for the derivation of an, āv.

373. As the Latin preposition inter is evidently identical with the Sanskrit antar and the Gothic undur, our unter (§§. 293. 294.), and i is a very common weakening of a, we must class also the preposition in and the kindred Greek ēv with the demonstrative base अन anā, although in and ēv, considered by themselves, admit of being referred to the base इ i, and the relation of ēvθa to the Zend अख idha, "here," might be deduced through the inorganic commixture of a nasal, as in अµφ, ambo, answering to the Sanskrit ubhadu and Slavonic oba. I now, however, prefer regarding the v of ēvθa, ēvθev, which bear the relation of locative and ablative to one another, as originally belonging to the base, and ēv

* See Kopitar's Glagolita, p. 59.
therefore, and the Latin *in*, the pronominal nature of which is apparent in *inde*, as connected with the Sanskrit चन *ana*. The $\Sigma$ of *eis*, from *έν*, appears to me an abbreviation of the suffix $σε$, which, in forms like *πόσε*, *ἀλλασσε*, expresses direction to a place, just as *ει-ς* is an abbreviation of *εσ-σί*, $δος$ of $δοθι$, *προς* of *προτι*. There would then be a fitting reason why *eis* should express direction to a place: it is opposed in meaning to *έν*, just as our *hin*, "towards," to *hier*, "here," only that the Greek expressions have lost their independent significance, and only precede the particular place denoted of rest, or to which motion is implied; like [G. Ed. p. 539.] an article the meaning of which is merged in that of its substantive. The preposition *ἀνά*, like the Gothic *ana*, our *σν*, has preserved more perfectly the pronominal base under discussion: *ἀνά* is opposed to *κατά*, as "on this side," to "on that side." The Gothic *anaks*, "suddenly," may likewise, in all probability, be classed here, and would therefore originally mean "in this (moment)." Its formation recalls that of *ἀπαξ*, the $ξ$ of which is perhaps an abbreviation of the suffix *κις* (§. 324.). If the Gothic *ks* is connected with the suffix of such numeral adverbs, then the removal of the $k$ has been prevented by the close vicinity of the $s$, though elsewhere the Gothic is not indisposed to the combination *hs*. In Lithuanian, *an-day*, from the base *ana*, points to past time, and signifies "that time," "lately," while *ta-day* refers to the future, and means "then."

374. The base चन *ana* forms, with the relative *यα*, the combination चन *anya*, and, with the comparative suffix तर *tara*, चनर *antara*, both expressions signifying *alius*, and in both the final vowel of the demonstrative base being dropped; for which reason the Indian grammarians do not admit चन *anya* to be a compound, any more than the previously discussed bases

---

* Compare §. 105. and "Demonstrative Bases and their connection with different Prepositions and Conjunctions," p. 9, *passim.*
nor do they see in antara any comparative suffix,* particularly as, besides the irregularity of its formation,† it is removed, by its signification also, from the common pronominal derivatives formed with tara (§. 292.), and expresses, not "the one," or "the other, of two," but, like त्वर [G. Ed. p. 540.] itara, "the other" generally. In Gothic, anthar, theme anthara, which has the same meaning, corresponds; in Lithuanian antra-s, "the other," "the second"; in Latin, alter, the n being exchanged for l (§. 20.), on which also is founded the relation of alius to अन्य anya-s, the base of which is preserved complete in the Gothic ALYA.† The Greek ἀλλος is removed one step further than alius from the original form, and, like the Prākrit अन्य an̄ya, and the Old High German adverb alles, "otherwise," has assimilated the y to the consonant preceding it (compare p. 401.). On the other hand, अन्य anya exists in a truer form, but with a somewhat altered meaning, in Greek, viz. as ἕνοι, "some," which may be well contrasted with the Sanskrit-Zend, anyē, "alii." From the base 'ENIO comes also ἐνίοτε "sometimes," as analogous to ἀλλοτε, ἐκάστοτε, &c., for the derivation of which, therefore, we need not have recourse to ἔνοι ὑπε, or ἐκαστιν ὑπε. In Old Sclavonic, in signifies "the other," and its theme is ino, and thus the y of the Sanskrit-Zend anya has been lost. The feminine nominative in Sclavonic is ina, the neuter ino.

375. Together with anya, antara, and itara, the Sanskrit has also two other words for the idea of "another," viz. अपर apar, and पर para. The former may have sprung from the preposition opa, "from," as apa itself from the demonstrative base अ a. With it is connected, as has been

* Anya is derived from an, "to live," and antara from anta, "end."
† The regular form would be anatara.
‡ Alya-kunds, "alienigenus," alyai vaihtai, "other things," alya thē, "elsewhere" (p. 384 &c.). In the nominative masculine I conjecture alyis, not alis (p. 358, Note ‡).
already observed (§ 350.), our aber, Gothic and Old High German afar (§ 87.), the original meaning of which is still evident in abermals, “over again,” “once more,” Aberglauben, “superstition,” Aberwitz, “over wit,” “false wit.” In Old High German afar means also, “again,” like the Latin iterum, answering to इतरस् itara-s, “the other.” पर para, is derived by apocope from apara: it is more [G. Ed. p. 541]. used than the latter; and though it has derivatives in the European cognate languages also, the Latin perendie may be among the first which has led to a reference to a word signifying “another.” It should properly signify “the morrow,” but the use of language often steps beyond the limits of what the actual form expresses; and thus, in the word alluded to, by “on the other day,” not the next following is implied, but the day after to-morrow. The language, therefore, proceeds from “this day” (hodie) to cras—in which an appellation of day is not easily perceived—and thence to “the other day,” perendie, the first member of which I regard as an adverbial accusative, with n for m, as in eundem. In the Sanskrit paré-dyus, “morrow,” paré, on the contrary, is apparently in the locative, and the last member in the accusative, if we regard it as the contraction of a neuter divas;* but in paré-dyavi both are in the locative. The Latin peren occurs also in perendino, perendinatio, the last member of which guides us to another Sanskrit appellation of day, viz. दिन dina. But to dwell for a moment on दिवस divas and पर para, I am of opinion that these two expressions are united in ves-per, ves-perus, and ἐσπέρα, as it were दिवसपर divas-para, which, if we look upon para as a neuter substan-

---

* I prefer this derivation to that I formerly gave (Kleinere Gramm. p. 323) from dyu with an irregular s; for from divas the step is as easy to dyus as from div to dyu. Divas, however, does not occur alone, but instead of it divasa: still the compounds divas-pati, “Heaven’s,” or “day’s lord” and divas-prithivyā, “heaven and earth,” shew the trace of it; for in the latter it is impossible to regard as as a genitive termination.
tive, would signify "the last, latest part of the day," and \textit{para},
used adjectively, and prefixed to another appellation of day,

\[\text{[G. Ed. p. 642.]}\] actually occurs with this meaning; for \textit{pardāhna} (from \textit{para} + \textit{ahna}) signifies "the later, or after part of the day" (see Glossary), as \textit{pūrvāhna} does "the former, or earlier part." Consequently \textit{vesper} would stand for \textit{dives-per} and this abbreviation of the appellation of day will not appear more remarkable than that of \textit{dvīs dwis}, "twice," to \textit{bis}. With respect to the loss of a whole initial syllable, I may refer to the relation of the Greek \textit{μείραξ}, \textit{μειράκιον}, to \textit{kumarś} \textit{kumāra-s}, "boy," which, by the suppression of its middle syllable, but with the retention of the initial one, has been corrupted to \textit{κόρος}, \textit{κοῖρος}. We turn now to another trace of \textit{para}, "the other," in Latin, which we find in the first portion of \textit{pereger} and \textit{peregrinus}, and which we could not well suppose to be the preposition \textit{per}. \textit{Pereger} would consequently signify "being in another land," like the Old High German \textit{eli-lenti}, and \textit{peregrinus}, "who from another land." We might also refer \textit{per-perus} to the same source, as the reduplication of \textit{perus} = \textit{परस् para-8}, in which the "bad and wrong" is opposed to "the right," as the other. In the cognate Greek \textit{πέρπερος} the fundamental meaning has taken a more special direction. Lastly, the particle \textit{πέρ} remains to be mentioned, the use of which is more of a pronominal than a prepositional nature. A word, which originally signifies "other," was well adapted to give particular emphasis to a relative, so as to bring prominently forward the persons or things denoted by it as other than those excluded. In this light let the French \textit{nous autres}, \textit{vous autres}, and our German \textit{wenn anders}, "if otherwise," "provided that," be considered, which is more energetic than the simple \textit{wenn}, "if."

\begin{itemize}
  \item Remark, also, the apparently pleonastic use of \textit{d̄hahos}; and similar phenomena in Sanskrit, as Nal. I. 14, in which men are opposed to the gods and to other beings not human, as \textit{others}: "Nowhere among the gods or Yakshas exists such beauty, nor amongst (others) men was such ever before seen or heard of."
\end{itemize}
From पर para comes in Sanskrit, pāra, [G. Ed. p. 543.]
"the further shore," and from this pārayāmi, "I complete":
to the former answers πέραν, to the latter πέραω.* In
German, in the word under discussion the idea of "other"
has been changed to that of "the further," Gothic fārra,
"far," the second r of which seems to have sprung from
n by assimilation. So early as even in Sanskrit, para
occurs in the sense of "far," in the compound pārdsu, "dead,"
"having life removed."

376. The Gothic yains (theme yaina), "that," Greek κεῖνος,
ἐκεῖνος, (ἈEol. κῆνος) and Doric τῆψος, correspond, in respect
to their last element, with the bases in the cognate languages
which are compounded with na, no; among which we may
especially notice ana-s (an’s) on, which has the same meaning
in Lithuanian and Scalavonic. In the Doric τῆψος, like
τῆλικος, τηνίκα, the vowel of the article is lengthened
(comp. §. 352.), and the ἈEolic κῆνος has the same relation to
the interrogative base KO, that τῆψος has to TO. But in
κεῖνος, to which ἐκεῖνος bears the same relation that ἐμῶν does
to μοῦ (§. 326.), instead of the base-vowel being lengthened
an i is introduced, and the o is weakened to e: compare,
in the former respect, the Sanskrit ए and the compound
रन एना (§. 369.). So, also, in the Gothic yain(a)s, "that,"
an i has been blended with the Sanskrit relative base य ya.
But if in German, as in Scalavonic, a y preceded the old
initial vowel, as in yesmy = धर्मस अस्मि, Lithuanian esmi,
"I am" (§. 255. n.), yains would then shew itself to be a
cognate form to रन एना, "this," the real countertype of
which we have, however, already found in the numeral ains,
theme aina (§. 308.). In Greek, the word [G. Ed. p. 644.]
δεῖνα, theme ΔΕΙΝ, may also be classed here. It is a plural
neuter, which has been peculiarly dealt with by the language:
its ει has the same relation to the o of the article that κεῖνος
has to KO (κοτε, κότερον), and the tenuis has been removed.

* Compare Vocalismus, p. 177, &c.
as in δὲ before mentioned (§. 350.). The ν, however, of ΔΕΙΝ can scarcely be connected with the appended pronoun ἐνα, but is more probably a mere phonetic affix, as in ΤΙΝ, of which hereafter, and in many words of our so-called weak declension (§. 142.).

377. The Zend demonstrative base မ မ မ မ မ မ aya, "this," has been already repeatedly mentioned. In it we find a new and powerful confirmation of the proposition—which is one of importance for the history of language—that pronouns and genuine prepositions are originally one; for in the Sanskrit, in which aya has been lost as a pronoun, it has remained as a preposition, with the signification "from," "down"; as e.g. ava-plu, ava-tar (_added), "to spring from," "to descend," but the original meaning of which is "to alight down or at this (place)." In Slavonic, aya has been changed, according to rule (§. 255. a), to ovo, which signifies "this" and "that": its fem. nom. ova is almost identical with the same case in Zend—မ မ မ မ မ မ aya. With this form is connected the Greek αν of αυτός, in which, after the suppression of the final vowel, the ν has been changed to a vowel. When used alone the pronominal nature of this base is most apparent in αυθα, "here," which, therefore, is not to be regarded as an abbreviation of αυτός, for it is quite as natural for the locative suffix to be attached to αν as to other pronominal bases. With the same

[G. Ed. p. 515.] signification as αυθα, we might expect to find αυθα, as analogous to ἐνθα and to the Zend မ မ မ မ မ မ avadha, which corresponds in its base, suffix, and signification. But the Greek expression does not occur alone, but only in combination with ἐνθα in ἐνταυθα for ἐνθαδιάντα; and so, also, the ablative adverb αυθεν is retained only in the compound ἐνταυθεν (p. 480). The indeclinable αν, the use of which is not opposed to its pronominal origin, has probably lost some suffix of

* Compare p. 387, Note *.
† p. 344. p. 480. The derivation of ἐνταυθα given at p. 387 must be corrected accordingly.
case or of another kind. If it were a neuter for aντ or ανδε the suppression of the T sound would accord with a universal phonetic law (comp. §. 155.). Perhaps it is an abbreviation of ανδε, which has the same meaning, or of αντε, which latter agrees in its formation with the pronominal adverbs τοτε, οτε, ποτε, though the signification has diverged.

378. Through a combination with the comparative suffix is formed ανταρ, "but," with reference to which we must again advert to the relationship of our German aber (Old High German ofar, "but," "again") with the Sanskrit apar, "alis." The suffix of ανταρ is distinguished from the customary τερος by the preservation of the original a-sound, and in this manner corresponds exactly to the Sanskrit antar (§. 293.). The Latin au-tem, on the other hand, appears to contain the superlative suffix, as i-tem in opposition to i-terum.*

The i of timus might easily be corrupted to e in a word terminating with a consonant. I now, however, prefer regarding the suffix tem of i-tem and au-tem as not originating in the Latin language, but as identical with the suffix चन्त ham, which, in Sanskrit, likewise occurs only in [G. Ed. p.546.] two pronominal adverbs, viz. in इथम it-tham, "so," and जपम ka-tham, "how?" with regard to which it may be left undecided whether their tham is connected, through a phonetic alteration, with the superlative suffix, just as thama in प्रथमस prathama-s, "the first" (p. 379. l. 12.). The Latin au-t appears to me an abbreviation of au-ti, so that it agrees in its formation with uti, ut, and iti in itidem, as also with the Sanskrit इतै iti, "so."† With regard to the au of auferio, aufero, I see no adequate reason for dissenting from the common opinion which regards it as a weakened form of

---


† The i of iti-dem might also be regarded as the weakening of the a of ita, caused by the addition of weight through the dem. (cf. §. 6.)
PRONOUNS.

ab.* On the other hand, the Sanskrit inseparable preposition ava, mentioned above (§ 377.), evidently re-appears in the Homeric αβέρπος,† without the ancient connection between this prepositional αγ and the particle αζ being thereby removed, as, as has been remarked above, the Sanskrit preposition ava and the Zend demonstrative base of similar sound, are cognate forms.

379. It has been elsewhere pointed out‡ that of the three forms into which the originally short a in Greek has been distributed (ε, ο, ἀ), it is ε that most often occurs in places

[G. Ed. p. 547] where a Sanskrit a is combined with υ; more rarely the weightier ο; and the still heavier α never.§ The Greek diphthong αυ, however, corresponds to the Vṛiddhi diphthong ची Ᾱ, as नादु = नादु: its a is therefore long, and is found so in नादुς, &c., for νάφος = νάδας. If, then, the final vowel of the Indo-Zend ava, Sclavonic ovo, be removed, and then the u, formed by the melting down of the υ, be combined in a diphthong with the initial vowel, we should have ευ or ου. As, however, αυ has arisen, we must regard the lengthening of the initial vowel as compensation for the final vowel, which has been suppressed. This compensation, however, does not take place universally; for as ου is plainly shewn, by its use, to be of pronominal origin,∥ it may be best compared with our demonstrative base ava, of which it is

* Without this weakening, affero, from alsfero, would be identical with affero, from adfero; and the change of the b into the cognate vowel may have taken place in order to avoid this identity, as, vice versa, the u of duo (originally a v) seems to have been hardened into b in bis. If, for this reason, au has arisen from ab on one occasion, it might be still further adopted without its being occasioned from a view to perspicuity.


‡ Vocalismus, p.193, &c.

§ This combination produces चो थ (§. 2.), which, before vowels, is resolved into an, as, gav-ām, "boum," from .Errorf.
further to be remarked, that, in Zend, in departure from §. 155., it forms the nominative and accusative neuter, not by ἡ ἥ but by m. For avēm, according to §. 42., aum should be employed; but in its place we have the irregular form त्रष्या aom, and the same in the masculine accusative.* I agree with Hartung (l. c.) in considering the Greek οὐ like likewise as an accusative, whether it be masculine, or, as we may assume from the Zend aom, neuter. The negative particle οὐ is also to be classed here, according to what has been said in §. 371., and before, in my Review of Rosen’s Vēda Specimen regarding the derivation of negative particles from pronouns: it has the same relation to οὐκ which, owing to its terminating with a consonant, is used before vowels, [G. Ed. p. 548.] that, in Latin, the prefix ne has to nec, an abbreviation of neque. οὐκ is, therefore, an abbreviation of οὐκέ (with the change of the tenuis, οὐχὲ'), the κί of which is, perhaps, connected with the Sanskrit enclitic pronominal base वच chi, of which more hereafter. To this वच chi the च cha, which is likewise enclitically used, and with which the Latin que is identical, bears the same relation that कस् kas, “who,” has to its neuter वच म् kim. If, then, the syllable κί of οὐκέ is connected with the Indian वच chi, it is also related to the Latin que of neque (compare §. 380., sub finem.)

380. It remains for us to shew that an offshoot of the pronominal base ava exists in German also. Such is our auch, the demonstrative signification of which is easily discoverable in sentences like er ist blind, und auch lahm, “he is blind and also lame,” in which the auch adds to the quality “blind,” as to “that,” another “this:” he is lame and this,—blind.” The auch performs the same service for a single quality that the conjunction dass, “that,” does for an entire member of a sentence; for in sentences like “I am not willing (dass) that he should come, the conjunction dass expresses generally

* Compare Burnouf’s Yaṣna, Notes p. 5.
or only grammatically, the subject of my will, and "he should come" expresses it particularly and logically. In Old High German, *auh* (*ouh, ouc, &c.*) has other meanings besides "also," which are elsewhere expressed only by derivatives from pronouns, as *denn, aber, son dern, "for," "but," &c.,* (see Graff I. 120.), and the Gothic *auk* occurs only with the meaning "for."* If *auch, "also," were the only meaning of the conjunction under discussion, in all German dialects, [G. Ed. p. 549.] we might suppose it to be connected with the Gothic *aukan, "to increase."† But what connection have *denn and son dern ("for" and "but") with the verb "to increase?" Moreover, verbal ideas and verbal roots are the last to which I should be inclined to refer the derivation of a conjunction. All genuine conjunctions spring from pronouns (§. 105.), as I have endeavoured to shew in a particular instance in my Review of Forster's Grammar.‡ But whence comes the *ch* of our *auch?* I do not think that it can be regarded in the same light as that of *doch* and *noch,* which have been likewise explained as pronominal formations,¶ but, in Gothic, terminate with *h* (*nauh, thauh*); while our *auch* bears the same relation to the Gothic *auk* that *mich, dich, sich,* do to *mik, thuk, sik.* The *k,* therefore, of *auk,* may perhaps, in its origin, coincide with that of the so-called pronominal accusative, and, like the latter, belong to the appended pronoun *sma* (§§. 174. 175.), which, in Zend, becomes *hma,* but in Prākrit and Pāli is transposed to *mha.* But if the pronoun *ava* were used in

* The meanings "but" and "also," which I have, in accordance with Fulda, given elsewhere (Demonstrative Bases, p. 14), rest on no authority. for Ulfilas gives only *auk* as answering to the Greek γάρ (Grimm III. 272).

† Compare Sanskrit áh, "to collect," whence *samaḥa,* "crowd."


¶ §. 370. and Demonstrative Bases, p. 18.
Pāli, its ablative would be *avamhā* and locative *avamhi* (comp. §. 369, Table). In the Gothic *auk* the sounds which surround the *h* in these forms are lost, and the final vowel of the base is suppressed, as in the Greek *aντρόσ*. With regard to the guttural, however, *auk* bears the same relation to *avamhā*, *avamhi*, that *ik* "I," does to छहे ahaṅ. If, of the forms of negation *ōk, ōki, ōχi*, mentioned at p. 533, the last were the original one, we might suppose the *χ* to be related to the Pāli pronominal locatives in म्हि *mhi*, as *χ* usually [G. Ed. p. 550] represents the Sanskrit and Pāli छ *ḥ* (§. 23.).

381. As regards the etymology of the base *ava*, the first member of it is easily perceived to be the demonstrative *a*, and the latter portion appears to be analogous to *iva, "as,"* from the base *i*, as also to *eva, "also," “merely,” &c., and with the accusative termination *ēvam, “so,”* from the base *ē* (§. 366.). *A-va* and *ē-va*, therefore, would be as closely connected as *a-na* and *ē-na*; and as from the latter has arisen the Gothic term for the numeral “one,” (theme *aina* §. 308.), so from *ēva* would come the Zend numeral for “one,” *aēva*, with a prefixed, according to §. 38. In Gothic, *aiv* (theme *aiva*) corresponds, which, however, as “all time,” *i.e.* “eternity,” answers to the cognate form in Zend as logical antithesis, or as “another” to “this.” It may be observed, that it is highly probable that our *all*, Gothic *alls, “omnis”* (theme *alla*), has been formed by assimilation from the base *alva, “alius,”* and has therefore experienced the same fate as the Greek *ἄλλος*, Old High German *alles, “else,”* and the Latin *ille, olle*. In Sanskrit, from the energetic subjective demonstrative base *sa, “he,” “this, “that,”* (§. 345), arises the general term for “all,” viz. सर्वे *sar-va “every,”* plural सर्वे *sarvē, “all,“* and the adverbs of time, चाँ *sādā*, and चाँ *sandā, “ever”*: from the latter comes the adjective संपत्ति *sanditana, “sempiternus.”* The final member of *sarva* is identical with that of our छ *ava, छ *ēva, and छ *iva;* and, with respect to the *r*, analogous
forms to sarva occur in etar-hi, "then," and kar-hi, "when?"* the h of which I consider as an abbreviation of dh, and the whole dhi as a cognate suffix to the Greek θ. (compare §. 23.]

[G. Ed. p. 551.] Thus etarhi, exclusive of the prefixed pronoun è, answers to τόθι, and kar-hi to τόθι, from κόθι. In the Gothic, tha-r, "there," in our dar in immerdar, (always) darbringen, "to offer," darstellen, "to represent," &c., and hva-r, "where?" (compare war-um, "wherefore," wor-aus. "whence," &c.) the syllable hi or dhi of the Indian prototype is wanting. We may notice, also, the compound hvar-yis, "which?" the last member of which belongs to the Sanskrit relative base व ya. In Lithuanian we have in kittur (kit-tur), "somewhere else," a form analogous to the Gothic locative adverbs in r. With the Sanskrit sarva, "every," may be compared the Old High German sôr, "omnino," our sehr, "much." But to return to the Gothic base aiva, we see clearly enough the pronominal origin of this word in expressions like ni aiv, "nunquam," ni aiva-day$, "on no day whatever," and still more in our je, "ever," Old High German, êo, io, which latter has been formed from aiv, by suppressing the a, and changing the v into a vowel; and by this alteration it has become estranged from êva, "eternity." A word, however, signifying merely eternity or time, would scarcely have entered into combinations like êo-man "aliquis," our "jemand," in which êo may be regarded as equivalent to the Zend aâva, "one;" so, also, in êo-wiht "aliquid," literally, "one thing," or "any one thing": ionêr means "anywhere," and, with respect to its r, agrees with the abovementioned locative adverbs (thar, hvar), and, in regard to its entire final syllable, with pronouns compounded with na, no (§. 376.); and this affords a striking proof that the preceding io cannot, from its origin,

---

* The Indian grammarians assume, without cause or reason, a suffix rhi for both these expressions, and distribute them thus, etar-rhi, ka-rhi.
be a term for denoting time. Perhaps, however, the Old High German *io* is not in all places the corruption of the Gothic *aiv*, for a short way of arriving at it is through the old relative base *ya*. It is certain that the Lithuanian *yû* belongs to it, which, in its use before comparatives in sentences like *yû bagotêsnis yû* [G. Ed p. 502.] *szyksztêsnis*, “*je reicher desto karger,*” “the richer the more niggardly,” corresponds exactly to the use of the German language, only that, as may be done in German also, the same expression is always retained in the corresponding sentence, as, in Sanskrit, the idea of one* is expressed by attraction, after relatives by *ya*, and after interrogatives by *ka* (see §. 308.). The Lithuanian *yû*, however, is clearly the instrumental of the base *yu*, which elsewhere signifies “he,” but, in this kind of expression, retains the old relative meaning. In Lithuanian, *yo* may be used for *yû*; and if this is not merely an abbreviation of *yû* (*yuo*), it is the genitive of the pronoun referred to; for *yis* (for *yas*), “he,” forms, in the genitive, *yo*. Ruhig renders, *Je eher je besser,* “the sooner the better,” by *yo pirm-yaus yo geraus.*† Graff (I. 517.) rightly compares the Old High German *io* with this Lithuanian *yo*, and the former must therefore be distinguished from the *io*, which are evidently corruptions of the Gothic *aiv.

* The meaning of this is, that if, in Sanskrit, a sentence be interrogative, the object of the verb likewise becomes interrogative, as it were by attraction, instead of being, as in English, indefinite. Thus, in the passage referred to §. 308., कथाः स पुरुषः पाण्य ब्रह्मात्यति ह्वनि कम् katha* sa* purushah Pârtha! kan ghâtayati hanti kam, “How, O Partha! can that man cause to be killed whom, can he kill whom?” The same attraction takes place in a relative sentence. Thus, in the Second Book of the Hitopadesa, यदेऽ रोचने यस्मै भवेत तत्र युद्धः रोहते yadéva rohate yasmâi bhavêt tat tasya sundaram, “Whatever is agreeable to whomsoever (in English it would be ‘to any one soever’), that to him will be beautiful.”—Translators Note.

† As addenda to §. 306. may be noticed the uninflected comparatives, which accord with the superlatives in *aus-as* (§. 307.).
In Latin we find in *ovum* a form evidently corresponding to this *aiv* (theme *aiva*), and one which has quite lost a pronominal signification. It may be left undecided whether the Greek *aiων* should be referred to this class. But we must remark that the syllable *va* of *σαβ* *σαβ*, *σαν βαν*, and *ινν* *ιαν*, is, as it appears to me, of itself a pronoun, and connected with the enclitic *vat*, "as." Perhaps the *v* is a weakened form of *m* (§ 63.), and *iva* therefore connected with the demonstrative *ima*. Observe that the derivative suffixes *vat* and *mat*, in the strong cases *vant*, *mant*, are completely identical in meaning, as are also *min* and *vin*.

[G. Ed. p. 553.] 382. We come now to the relative, the base of which is, in Sanskrit and Zend, *ya*, feminine *yd*; and the offshoots of which, in the European cognate languages, have been already frequently mentioned. With respect to the Greek *δς*, *η*, *δ*, answering to the Sanskrit *yas*, *yd*, *yat*, we may notice how frequently the Indian *ν* *y* is represented by the Greek *spiritus asper*. And *δς* has the same relation to *yas* that *υμεις* has to the Vedic *νους* *yushma*, "ye," *yosμην* to *νοσμη* *yudhma*, "strife," *ηναρ* to *κριτ* *yakrit* and *μερ* to *κριτ* *yaj*, "to honor," "to adore," *μερος* to *κριτ* *yam*, "to restrain." The circumstance, that the relative is dialectically replaced by the article, is as little proof of the connection of the two, as that, because our German *welcher*, "which," can be replaced by the demonstrative *der*, "the," it is cognate to it in form. Since, as early as Homer, the use of the true relative is very common, and the relative expressions *δος*, *ός*, *ηλικος*, *ημος*, answer to the demonstrative derivatives *τος*, *τοι*, *τηλικος*, *τιμος*, we may find in this alone sufficient evidence, exclusive of proofs drawn from the Sanskrit and other cognate languages, of the original existence of a distinct relative base in Greek.

383. In Zend the relative occurs also with a demonstrative meaning: thus we frequently find the accusative
yim in the sense of hunc. This guides us to the Lithuanian yis, “he” (euphonic for yas, § 135.)* accusative yin. The dative yam corresponds with the Sanskrit yasmâi, Zend yahmâi; as does the locative yame (§ 176.) with yasmin, yahmi. In Scslavonic ye is the most perfect form that has been retained in the masculine and neuter singular of this pronominal base (see p. 368 G. ed.): in the neuter plural ya agrees most exactly with the Zend and Vedic yâ (§. 255. a.), just as, in the nominative singular feminine, ya (ya-she, “which”) corresponds to the Sanskrit-Zend yâ. The masculine form i is derived, as has been already remarked, by suppressing the vowel of the base, and vocalising the y, and thus resembles tolerably closely the Gothic relative particle ei (=î). In Gothic, however, there exist derivatives from the base under discussion, which are even yet more similar. For instance, the conjunction ya-bai, “if,” springs from it as the cognate form of the Sanskrit यदि ya-di, which signifies the same. The suffixes alone differ. The Gothic bai is a corruption of ba,† and appears in this form in the compound thauh-yaba. There is an analogous form to yabai, yaba, viz. iba, ibai,‡ which is used particularly as an interrogative particle, and proceeds from the pronominal base i. Combined, also, with the negative particle ni, iba means “if”; thus niba (for ni iba, as nîst, “he is not,” for ni ist), “if not,” where we must remark that the Sanskrit यत् it connected with iba, as regards its base, likewise means “if”; and, indeed, in like manner only

* In Zend the i of yim is not produced by the euphonic influence of the y, for we also find dim for dêm (§. 343.), and dru jim for drujêm, from dru j, “a demon.”


‡ Compare Demonstrative Bases, p. 15, and Graff (1. 75.), who assents to my opinion, but designates the pronominal bases as adverbs of place, or locative particles.
in combination with particles preceding it; so that *nēt
(na+it), "if not," is, as it were, the prototype of the Gothic
n'-iba (see §. 360.). It can hardly be that the suffix, also,
does not contain somewhat of Sanskrit. I conjecture a
connection with the syllables va in iva, "as," ēv-a, "also,
&c., and ē-vam, "so," or what almost amounts to the same
thing, with the enclitic चत vat, "as." And thus the deri-
vation of the Gothic adverbs in iva may be shewn.* It cannot appear surprising that the v is
hardened to b, for in Bengali every Sanskrit v is pro-
nounced as b, and in New German, also, we often find b
for the v of the older dialects. In Lithuanian the v of
the Sanskrit iva, "as," is altered to p, as we have before
seen pa formed from ख सवा (§. 359.). No more satisfactory
derivation, therefore, can, in my opinion, be given for pro-
nominal adverbs terminating in ipo or ip, than from the
इव iva above mentioned, particularly as the latter is con-
stantly subjoined, as तद इव tad iva, "like this." So, in
Lithuanian, tampo or taip, "so," i. e. "as this," from the base
ta+ipo; kaipo or kaip, "how"? kittaipo, kittaip, and
antraipo, antraip, "else." Another view of these expres-
sions might be taken, according to which i would be
allotted to the principal pronoun, which would be regarded
as neuter (§. 157.); thus tai-po, kai-po, &c. In this case
the vowel of the Sanskrit इव iva would be lost in Lithu-
anian; but I prefer the former opinion, and believe that
the Gothic hvaiva, "how"? taken as hva-iva, must be

* Not aba, for the a belongs to the adjective base; hence those in u
have, not v-aba but u-ba; but those in ya, for the most part, lay aside
their final vowel, and form i-ba for ya-ba. Examples: frŏda-ba, "intelli-
gent," from FRÔDA (nom. frôths); hardu-ba, "hard," from HARDU;
andaugi-ba, "evident," perhaps from the substantive base ANDAUGYA
(nominative anduugi), "visage." The full form is seen in gabauryn-ba,
"willing."
referred to this class; for it cannot appear remarkable that
the termination va, in Gothic, should not have been every-
where hardened to ba, but that a trace of the original
form should be still left. But if the sva, “so,” answering
to hvaiva, does not, as has been before conjectured, belong
to the Sanskrit reflexive base श swa (§. 341.), I should then
regard it as analogous to hvaiva, and divide it thus, s'-va,
so that it would contain the demonstrative base sa, men-
tioned in §. 345., from which, in Sanskrit, [G. Ed. p. 556.]
comes, among other words, सदृश sa-drisa; “similar,” liter-
ally “like this appearing.” But to return to the Sanskrit
yadi, “if,” its di is probably a weakened form of the suffix,
which we have seen above in इत्य iti, “thus,” and else-
where, also, in नित ati, “over,” and altered to धि dhi in
धि adhi, “on,” “towards.” The Prākrit जार jai (§. 19.)
has quite dropped the T sound, just as the Lithuanian yey:
through both languages the Greek ει is, as it were, prepared;
as to the connection of which with our relative base I have no
longer any doubt, all being regular up to the suppression of
the semi-vowel in the initial sound; and by a similar suppress-
ion we have not been prevented from recognising the
Vedic युष्मे yushman, “ye,” in the Æolic ὑμεσ.

384. The Gothic particle yau, in the signification “whether,”
coinciding with the Sanskrit यदि yadi, which together with
“if” means also “whether,” supports the derivation of ba
from va, given above; for yau has essentially the same
relation to yaba, that, in Lithuanian, taip bears to the more
full tai po. The form yau; however, probably owes its
origin to a time when, in more perfect accordance with the
Sanskrit, yava for yaba was still used, whence, after suppress-
ing the a, must come yau, as e. g. the base thiva, “servant,”
forms in the nominative thius, in the accusative thiu. But if
yau arose at a time when yaba was already in use for yava, we
should have to refer to the relation of the Latin au (aufugio,
aufero) to ab. The Lithuanian has likewise a particle yau,
which is connected, in its base at least, with the Gothic: it signifies "already," i.e. "at this (time)", and therefore reminds us of jam, which, in Latin, is the only remnant of the pronominal base under discussion. Perhaps the u in the Lithuanian form is the dissolution of a nasal, by which jam

[G. Ed. p. 557.] and yau would be brought still closer, and the latter would be related to the former, as buwau, "I was," to the Sanskrit जभवम् abhavam (compare §. 255. g.). With the Gothic jam and Lithuanian yau must be classed, also, the Gothic yu, "now," "already," which, in respect to its u, is an analogous form to the nu, "now," mentioned above (p. 535 G. ed.), and, with than, forms the combination yuthan, "already." This furnishes a new proof that yu is probably but an abbreviation of the Sanskrit य यु "day;" for if this were the case, it would follow the demonstrative, and thanyu or thayu would be used, as in Latin hodie, and in Old High German hiutu, in Sanskrit a-dya, in Greek σήμερον. The Old High German ie in ie zwo, whence our jetzo, jetzt, is probably a weakened form of the Gothic yu, and literally signifies "to this," with a preposition subjoined. It first occurs in an inscription of the twelfth century (Graff I. 516.), for which reason it cannot be matter of surprise that the u is corrupted to e.

385. There remain to be noticed, in order to complete the list of the remnants of the Sanskrit relative base, the affirmative particle ya, yai, (compare §. 371.) and the copulative yah, "and," "also." The form ya may be taken as neuter, analogous to the interrogative hva, "what?" and, like the latter, it is indeclinable. The more usual form yai may have sprung from ya, through the inclination, which the a manifests, even in Sanskrit, to form a diphthong with the addition of an i (§. 158.). Hence there arises an apparent affinity of declension with the sole pronominal neuter in Lithuanian, viz. tai. The copulative particle yah is identical in its final h with the Latin que
and Sanskrit च चा, which is likewise subjoined, and which owes its origin to the interrogative base का, on which we will bestow a closer examination in the following paragraphs.

386. The interrogative bases in Sanskrit [G. Ed. p. 558.] are three, according to the three primary vowels, viz. का, कु, कि. The two latter may be looked upon as weakened forms of the first and principal one, for which reason I shall take them in the order of the diminution of the weight of the a.* From का का springs the whole declension of the masculine, as also that of the neuter, with the exception of the singular nominative and accusative जिसं किम्. The neuter जतं कात्, which is obsolete as far as regards its isolated use, and on which the Latin form quod is founded, is easily recognised in the interrogative particle काचित् kach-chit, euphonic for कात-चित्: it also appears as the prefix in expressions like काद-धवनं kad-adhwan,† “a bad street,” literally, “what sort of a street!” Other interrogative expressions are similarly prefixed, in order to represent a person or thing as bad or contemptible, as I have already previously noticed.‡ But since then my conjecture regarding the cognate form in Sanskrit has been still more confirmed by the Zend, where भो कात् is actually the common neuter of the interrogative. From the masculine and neuter base का का springs, in Sanskrit and Zend, the feminine base कि, which, according to §. 137., appears in the nominative singular without inflexion. Not one of the European cognate languages agrees better

* Vocalismus, p. 227, Rem. 16.
† Kad for कात्, according to §. 93.
‡ Götting. Anzeig. 1821, p. 352. Wilson, on the other hand, follows the native grammarians in deriving both the interrogative particle kachchit and kad-adhwan, and similar compounds, from कात् for कुत्, “bad”; and it appears that the connection of the prefixes कात् and कु with the interrogative has quite escaped the Indian grammarians.
with the twin Asiatic sisters than the Lithuanian, in which
the masculine nominative *kas* is completely identical with

[G. Ed. p. 559.] the Sanskrit कस *kas*, over which, too, it
maintains this superiority in the retention of the original
form, that its *s* remains unalterable, and is not liable to
suppression, while the Sanskrit *kas* is changed into *kahi*, *kā*,
and *ka*, according to the quantity of the initial sound follow-
ing, or before a following pause, and retains the original
sibilant, according to a universal law of sound, only before

र *t*, and च *th*, and changes it before च *ch*, छ *chh*, or ड *ḍ*,
ड *ṭh*, into the sibilant of the corresponding organ. In the
corresponding Zend form there is this remarkable peculiarity,
that, if followed by the singular of the pronoun of the second
person, the latter combines with the preceding interrogative,
and forms one word—a combination which is of course only
phonetic, and has no influence on the sense. Though I have
no doubt this combination has been occasioned simply by the
tendency in several languages to unite *s* and *t*, or *th*, still
in the case before us a conjunctive vowel has been, in the
course of time, introduced in Zend; and indeed, according
to the oldest MSS., an ē,* in the sense of §. 30. As, however,
in the edited codex of the V.S., in two out of four passages
in which कैथवाम् *kaśēthwaṁ*, "who thee," should be
read, we find instead *kaśe* thwaṁ; and in one passage, indeed, these words occur combined, but still with a long ē,
*kaśēthwaṁ*; and, in the fourth case, there is an erroneous
reading, *kaśithwaṁ*: I was therefore formerly of opinion
(Gram. Crit. p. 327.), that we might consider the ē or i,
combined with *kas*, as analogous to the Greek demon-
strative ἕ; a conjecture which must be withdrawn, owing to
the various readings since published by Burnouf, and the
inference (l. c. p. 108) thence deduced. With the dative

* Burnouf's Yaṣna, Note R. p. 134.
and with my nā, "man," māy kas' forms, without an auxiliary vowel, the combination ṭṛṣṭaṃ kastē, māṃ kastā (Burnouf l. c. p. 409).

387. According to § 116., from the Sāskrit-Zend-Lithuanian interrogative base KA must come the Greek KO, which, retained in Ionic, has elsewhere become ΠΟ, through the easy interchange of gutturals and labials. The declension, however, of this KO or ΠΟ is disused in favour of that of τίς, and the only remains of it are adverbs and derivatives, as κότε, πότε, κόσ, πόσ, κότερον, πότερον (cf जतर कतारस, "whether of the two?"); κόσος, πόσος, κούς, πούς, which are clear enough proofs of the original existence of a κός, κή, κό. These form the foundation of those cases of the Latin interrogative and relative, which belong to the second declension, viz. quod (=σω ἢ κατ), quo, and, in the plural, qui, quorum, quos. The plural of the neuter quae differs from the common declension, according to which it should be qua. The form quae, however, may have remained from the dual, which is otherwise lost in Latin, and may have assumed a generally plural signification; for quae* agrees, as has been already remarked (§. 234.), exactly with the Sanskrit dual त्र kē. The Latin feminine is founded, in the cases peculiar to it, on the Indo-Zend feminine base kā: compare, for instance, quam with काम kām, quārum with कासाम kāsām, quās with कास kās. The singular nominative quae, however, is remarkable, standing as isolated in Latin grammar as the neuter plural nominative just mentioned; for the demonstrative hic (of which more hereafter), is, in its origin, identical with the pronoun under discussion, the feminine nominative of which should be qua, which it actually is in the compound ali-qua, &c. Whence, then, the forms quae and hae-c? If they are not corruptions of qua, for which no reason can be assigned, or

* Regarding quae as pl. neuter, see §. 394.
weakened forms of the originally long quā (§. 137.), by the last element of d (=ā + ā) becoming i, [G. Ed. p. 561.]
there is no course left but to regard the ae of qua, hae-c, as a remnant of the feminine character igit mentioned in §. 119.
As, however, in Sanskrit and Zend, the masculine and neuter a of the primitive is dropped before this feminine i, and from ḫ ka might be formed, in the feminine base, ki (compare §. 172.), but not kē, I now prefer, contrary to my former opinion,* the explanation pointed out above—that the long d, which should be found in the uninflected nominative of bases in d, has, in the first place, been so weakened, as is usual in the vocative of the corresponding Sanskrit class of words, in which सुते sutē, (= sutāi) "daughter!" bears the same relation to sutā that qua does to ḫ kā; and, secondly, by the complete abbreviation of the d, which, in Sanskrit, is the case only in a small number of vocatives, e.g. अम्मा amma, "mother!" from ammā.

388. In Gothic, according to a universal law of permutation, the old tenuis of the interrogative base has passed into h; and as gutturals freely combine with v, with this h a v has been joined as euphonic; hence HVA from ḫ ka, and, in the feminine, HVŌ (according to §. 69.) from ḫ kā. The v has remained alone in our wer, "who?" We have before drawn attention to the masculine nominative hvā-s, with respect to its grammatical importance (§. 135.), and have remarked that the feminine nominative hvā, as also sv, "this," has not admitted, owing to its being monosyllabic, the shortening of the ā to a, which takes place elsewhere in this case (§. 137. *) In the neuter hvā the inflection ta is wanting, in which respect the Old High German huaz (Old Saxon huat) is more perfect. In

* Influence of the Pronouns on the Formation of Words, p. 3.
occur, but only that compounded with the definitive, originally relative pronoun (§. 282.): hence, nom. ky-i (ko-i, §. 255. d. p. 332. G. ed.), ka-yə, ko-e, genitive masculine and neuter ko-eyo, feminine ko-eya, &c. The same principle is followed in Old High German, only the cases do not occur in which the combination of the interrogative base and old relative base would be most perceptible, with the exception of the instrumental huiu (=hwu). German wie, the simple form of which would be huu (hwu). It is a question, however, whether huiu be really an instrumental, and not from the Gothic hvaiva, “how” (p. 555. G. ed.). The feminine, if it were used, would be, in the singular nominative, huiu, and, in the plural, huio (Grimm, 796.). The masculine singular forms huër, huës, huëmu, huën (or huënan); and the case is the same here with regard to the more concealed appended pronoun, as above with dër, dës, dëmu, dën (§. 356.). The Old Saxon, on the other hand, clearly displays in the masculine nominative singular huie, the old relative base, just as in the demonstrative thie, which latter forms the truest countertype of the Sanskrit base य त (§. 353.) The Middle Netherlandish shews quite plainly, in the whole masculine singular of the interrogative, the appended relative य a, the semivowel being corrupted to i and the a to e; but the guttural of the interrogative base has disappeared, and only the euphonic affix w has remained; thus, w-ie, w-ies, w-ien, w-ien. With respect to the latter portion of the word compare the Sanskrit yas, yasya, yasmā, yam; the Lithuanian yis, yo, yam, yin; and the Gothic yis, yis, yamma, yana, contained in hvar-yis (p. 551. G. ed.) The Old High German yenr is also to be viewed in the same light, the base of the old relative being added, that is to say, to the Gothic base yaina, and what has been said above [G. Ed. p. 563.] (p. 504) of dēsēr applies to the long ē. Perhaps, too, the ē of the locative adverb ionēr, “anywhere” (p. 536), which has been before mentioned, is to be viewed in the same light, as from iona-ir. The feminine of yenr is yenu, with i suppressed
(compare §. 288. Rem. 5. p. 383. G. ed.); on the other hand, in
the Middle High German *yeniu*, and, according to Notker, *eniu*,
and in the masculine, *en*ūr. If these forms, in which the initial
*y* is wanting, are, not abbreviated from *yenēr, yeniu*, but genu-
ine, then they would belong to the Sanskrit *ana, “this,”* and

389. We turn to the second interrogative base men-
tioned in §. 386., viz. ॐ ku, from which spring only the ad-
verbs ॐ kwā, “where?” and ॐ ku-laś, “whence?” perhaps, also, ॐ kwa, “where?” if it is to be distributed
into ku-a, not into k'-va; further in the Zend བུ། kūtha,
“how?” which would lead us to expect a Sanskrit བུ།
kūthā, for which, however, ॐ kham hatham is used; for ॐ
ku is prefixed in a deteriorating, derisive sense, as in
ॐ kutanu, “having an ugly body,” properly “having a
what sort of body?” a title of Kuvera. In Zend this ku
occurs as a prefix to verbs, where it gives additional emphasis
to the negative expressed by ཧན། nōit, and signifies “any
one whatever.” Thus we read in the beginning of the Vendidad,

nōit kūlat sāitām* yēidhi zi nōit azēm dāidhyāmn, &c., “not

[G. Ed. p. 64.] any one could have created them if I had not
created them.” Under this class might be brought the Latin
genitive cu-jus and the dative cu-i, which belong to the fourth
declension, as the obsolete forms quojus, quoī, from the base

QVO = KO, ॐ ka, do to the second. It is not requisite,
therefore, to consider the classical forms cujus and cui as
corruptions of quo-jus, quo-i; for as the base cu, as is apparent
from the Sanskrit and Zend, is in its origin equally old with

* This appears to me an abbreviation of ṣādvaitām, and presupposes a
Sanskrit ṣāḥavat together with ēṭavat (from ēṭa’, §. 344.). The initial ē
has been dropped, but has left its influence on the sibilant following:
hence sāitāṁ for shāitām (§§. 51. 52.), not hāitīm. Remark the Zend

> doṣu ṣādu, mentioned before, as compared with the Sanskrit asdu, unless
the conjecture mentioned §. 55. is well grounded.
QVO, from it may have proceeded cujus, cui, cujus, or cujatis, which may have existed together with quojus, quoi, quojas, as quid, from the base QVI, together with quod from QVO. Considering, however, that, in Sanskrit, the whole interrogative declension, with the exception only of kim, comes from the base ka—on which the Latin QUO is based—just as in Lithuanian it all comes from KA, and in Gothic from HVA; and that the rarely-occurring base ku has, in the European cognate languages in particular, left us no traces which can be relied upon;—under these considerations I now prefer, contrary to my former opinion,* deriving cujus, cui, from quojus, quoi; so that, after rejecting the o, the semi-vowel preceding has been changed into a vowel, as, in Sanskrit, u frequently appears as the abbreviation of the syllable va, as ukta spoken for vakta, and even in the Latin cutio (concutio) from quatio. Qu, however, = kv, whether the v in this place be pronounced like the English v or German w—and the Latin like the Gothic (§ 86. 1.) loves the euphonic addition of a v after gutturals; hence the forms QVO and HVA, in the interrogative, correspond in their difference from the Sanskrit, Zend, and Lithuanian KA, and thus aqVa, and the Gothic ahva, “river,” shew an agreement when [G. Ed. p. 565.] contrasted with the Sanskrit जप ap, “water,” with the common interchange between gutturals and labials. We must observe, also, the relation of angiVis to the Sanskrit घहेस ahi-s, “snake,” and Greek ἕχες. If, then, as I doubt not, cujus, cujus, cui, spring from quojus, quojas, quoi, as cum, “since,” from quum, cur, from quare, then we must also derive uter, uti, ut, ubi, and unde, from lost forms like quoter, &c., and the latter would correspond tolerably well with the Gothic hvathar (§ 292.). It is certain that uter, and the other interrogative and relative expressions commencing with u, have lost a preceding guttural, as amo has, compared with कामयामि kāmayāmī, “I love,” and nosco, nascor, from gnosco, gnascor. The more perfect culri, cunde, is still preserved in the com-

pounds *ali-cubi*, *ali-cunde*;* as the root of the verb substantive is retained more truly in the compound participles *ab-sens* and *præ-sens*, than in the simple *ens*, answering to the Sanskrit *cat*, nominative *san*, accusative *santam*. Under this head are to be classed, also, *unquam*, *usquam*, *uspiam*, *usque*: the interrogative meaning, however, is removed by their last element, just as in *quisquam*, *quispiam*, and *quisque*. In abbreviating *cu* (from *QVO*) to *u* all these forms agree, in some measure, with our German *wer*, "who?" in which only the element which has been added for the sake of euphony, according to §. 86. 1., has remained of the consonants which belonged originally to the base. It might, indeed, be asserted, that the *u* of *uter*, and other interrogative expressions beginning with *u*, has nothing in common with the euphonic *v* of the base *QVO*, but that it is the original *a* of [G. Ed. p. 566.] *

*ka* weakened, and that thus *uter* is a corruption of *kataras*, by simply dropping the *k* and changing the *a* to *u*. To this it may be objected that *u* in Latin, does, indeed, often enough correspond to an Indian *a*, but still principally only before liquids and before a final *s*: the *消费需求* of *kataras*, however, it might be expected, would, under the most favourable circumstances, remain unchanged, or, more probably, be altered to *ē*, as in *kóterov* or to *ē* or *ĩ*.

390. The third interrogative base फ़ि कि� is more fertile of derivatives than फ़ कु, both in Sanskrit and in the cognate languages. From it comes the word *kim*, "what"? (as nominative and accusative) which has been frequently mentioned, which is so far isolated in Grammar, as otherwise substantive and adjective neuters in *a* alone make *m* the sign of the nominative and accusative singular (§. 152.),

*I* do not think that these words can be distributed thus, *alic-ubi*, *alic-unde*, and that we can assume a compound of *ALIQUI*, with *ubi*, *unde*; but as *ali*, as the abbreviation of *ALIO*, is the first member of the compound *ali-quis*, so it is also that of *ali-cubi* and *ali-cunde*. 
and bases in i use the simple theme. We should have looked, therefore, for ki, or, according to the pronominal declension, तिः kī, before sonant letters तिः kid. Of the prior existence of this form there can be scarce any doubt, after what has been before said of the neuter इत it and चित chit: it is, however, confirmed by the Latin quid and the Lithuanian kitur, “elsewhere,” which I regard as a compound, and distribute thus kil-tur, with regard to which the szit-tas before cited (§. 357.), may be again brought to notice, which, with reference to its lost portion, is identical with that of kil-tur, of which mention has been before made as locative adverb. That, in Sanskrit also, there existed a masculine nominative. तिः kis, as prototype to the Latin quis, perhaps with a more full declension, is proved by the compounds महिस mākis and नकिस nakis, which occur, perhaps, only in the Vēdas, and the former of which probably signifies the same as the corresponding néquis (from méquis, §. 371.), and Zend māchis,* [G. Ed. p. 567.] while the latter agrees in meaning with the Zend अक्षेष्व naēcis, “not any one,” “no one.” Grammarians, however, include both expressions among the indeclinables, and write them महिर mākir, नकिर nakir, which Colebrooke renders, together with महिम mākim and नकिम nakim, by “no,” “except,”† without signifying that they are masculine nominatives, which might be very easily understood without the aid of the Zend.

391. Other derivatives from the interrogative base रिक
PRONOUNS.

ki are *kāḍiśa,* "similar to whom?" and analogous forms, of which more hereafter, and इद्रिष्ठ kiyat, "how much?" in the strong cases (§. 129.) इद्रिष्ठ kiyant, hence nominative masculine kiyān, accusative kiyantam. As k easily passes into h, and, in Germanic, the old tenues are almost always changed into aspirates, and e.g., k to h; and as जूत hrid and ह्रिदया, "heart," correspond to the Latin cor and Greek κηρ and καρδία; so, perhaps, also hi, "for," may be regarded as the weakened form of इक ki, with the transition of the interrogative signification into the demonstrative, which is easily intelligible, and which occurs also in the Greek γάρ, which, with regard to its formation, appears analogous to the Gothic ᵃहار, thar, and Sans. kar-hi. As to the change of the tenuis to the medial, it cannot be more a matter of difficulty than in δέ and δεῖνα (§§. 350. 376.). We may here mention, as derivatives from the interrogative, the particles κε (Doric κα), κευ, γε (Doric γα). The Sanskrit hi,

[G. Ed. p. 568.] however, occurs in ज्वर hyas, "yesterday," which I think may be distributed into hi + as, and considered as "that day;" for words which signify "yesterday," "to-day," "to-morrow," (as far as the elements, concealed in them, and often so altered as to be quite undistinguishable, admit of any derivation at all,) can be traced only to pronouns and terms denoting "day." The as, therefore, of hy-as, may be a weak remnant of divas, "day," as in our er of heuer—Middle High German hiure, from hiu-yāru—there is concealed the word Jahr, "year," which is in Zend जूत yārē, a remnant of which is to be found, also, in the Latin hornus, with nu, no, as derivative. In the Greek χθές, the θ appears to have arisen by a kind of semi-assimilation from the older semi-vowel (compare §. 300. p. 414 G. ed.), by which its etymology is still more obscured. In the Latin heri, from hesi (compare hesternus, Sanskrit hyas-tana-s), a demonstrative element is more perceptible than in χθές, from the partial retention of hic. The g of the German gestern, "yes-
terday," Gothic *gistra.* is a consequence of the regular transition of old aspirates into medials, but otherwise the *gis,* to which the *tra* is affixed as mark of derivation, resembles the Sanskrit शत hyas tolerably well.

392. From gestern we proceed to morgen; but we must first settle the derivation of a word, which, in Sanskrit, signifies "all," "every," and in which I recognise an affinity to चस śwas, "to-morrow"; I mean विष्व viswa, which, in Zend, according to §. 50., becomes विस्पा vīspa, and in Lithuanian is changed by assimilation into wissa-s, whence *wissur,* "everywhere," analogous to the abovementioned *kittur,* "elsewhere." The first portion of the Sanskrit विष्व viswa, I believe to be the preposition *vi,* which expresses "separation," "dissipation," "diffusion," and, with the aid of a pronoun, may be well adapted to express the idea "all." There remains श्व śwa, as a pronoun, in which it may be observed, that श्व ś is of guttural origin, and represented, in the classical languages, by k, c (§. 21.); so that श्व śwa appears to be related to the interrogative base, with a euphonic v, as in the Gothic *HVA,* and Latin *QVO.* Observe further, that, in Lithuanian, *kas,* combined with the appended particle *gi,* which is probably a softened *ki,* signifies both "who then?" and "every." And without *gi,* *kas diēn,* means "all days," and diēn-isskay, with the interrogative appended, signifies the same. But to return to the Sanskrit विष्व vi-śwa, "all," I take its latter portion to explain चस śwas, "to-morrow," with which the Latin *cras* is connected (§. 20.) We should, however, probably distribute thus, ś-vas, so that the pronominal base is represented only by its consonant, as in the Sclavonic *k-to,* "quis?" (§. 297.). The syllable वस vas, however, we refer to दिवस divas, an appellation.

* Gistra-dagis occurs Matt. vi. 30. in the sense of "morrow."
of "day," which would therefore be less altered by one letter than in सत्र hy-as, "yesterday," and which agrees with the Latin ves in ves-per (§. 375.).

393. We return to the interrogative base ब्रेक ki, which has led us to its corruption ब्रेक hi, and thence to the derivation of ब्रेक hy-as, "yesterday," and ब्रेक स्वास, "morrow." In Zend I have hitherto found the base ग्रेक ki, unchanged only in the neuter plural nominative, ग्रेक ky-a (from ki-a) (§. 233.); with which may be compared the Latin qui-a, which Max. Schmidt (De Pron. p. 34), perhaps rightly, has taken as the plural neuter. The Sanskrit and Zend, therefore, mutually complete the declension of the interrogative, so

[G. Ed. p. 670.] that the former admits the base ki only in the nominative and accusative singular; the latter in the plural; while in Latin the corresponding QVI enters more largely into the declension; so that quis and quem have quite dislodged the quus and quum, which might have been expected from the base QVO, or, in the case of the latter word, have restricted it to its use as a conjunction. And in the dative plural, quibus has abolished the use of quis, queis, which spring from QVO. In the ablative singular, however, qui, from QVI, has been superseded by quō, from QVŌ, or its use has been much diminished by it; just as, in the plural, the obsolete ques is supplied by qui and quos. I have elsewhere noticed, that four declensions (the first in the feminine), enter into the declension of the Latin relative interrogative and hi-c, which is identical with it in origin.* The use of the fourth is, however, only apparent, as cu-i above has been shewn to be a contraction of quoī, which belongs to the second declension, and, with respect to the more true retention of

* Influence of Pronouns on the Formation of Words, pp. 3, 4. Max. Schmidt (De Pron. Gr. et Lat. p. 33) has discussed this subject almost simultaneously with myself, and viewing it in the same light.
the case-termination, agrees with other obsolete forms, as popoloi Romanoi (§. 200.).

394. That hic is identical in origin with quis, qui, is shewn by its sharing in the peculiarities and mixed declension of the latter,—peculiarities which belong exclusively to hi-c and qui, quis, viz. the feminine haæ-c, and the plural neuter of the same sound. The reason of the non-existence of hæ-c, together with the form given above, as might have been expected from the analogy of aliqua, siqua, &c., is, that haæ does not occur at the end of compounds; for it seems not to admit of any doubt that quæ is reduced

[G. Ed. p. 571.] to quã, on account of the increased weight of the compound, which has occasioned the lightening of its latter part. Though si quis, ne quis, may be written separately, and a word may sometimes be interposed between them; still, where they occur together, they really belong to one another, and form a compound, like the corresponding मक्षि mäkis, नक्षि nakis, in Sanskrit, and, in Zend, मधिस måchis, नाधिस naðchis. Contrary to the conjecture expressed at §. 387., I now prefer regarding the neuter-plural forms quæ and haæ-c, not as remains of a dual, and thus corresponding to the Sanskrit श्ल kæ, but as exhibiting in their æ a weakening of the older ā, which originally belongs to the nominative and accusative plural of the neuter of bases in ṭ (from ā); but which in Zend, according to §. 231., is retained only in monosyllabic themes, just as, in the nominative singular feminine, its being monosyllabic is the cause of the retention of the original length of a (§. 137.). This principle is observed in Gothic in both places; thus stö (from stā), "hæc," hvd, "quæ?" and, in the neuter plural, in which the interrogative cannot be cited, thö. This thö, then, being the only monosyllabic form of its kind, and remarkable for its ð (= d), for ā, as has been noticed by Grimm (I. 790.), coincides with the Latin quæ and haæ-c, which, both in the singular nominative feminine
and neuter plural, are the only monosyllabic forms of their kind; and as, for this reason, they are qualified to retain the long \( a \), that letter is not entirely shortened, but changed to \( æ (=ā+i) \), and afterwards, in compounds, reduced to short \( a \), which is more suitable to polysyllabic forms: thus we have aliquá, both in the feminine and in the neuter plural.

[G. Ed. p. 572.] 395. **Hi-c** resembles the Sanskrit ः hi before mentioned in the irregular change of the old tenuis to the aspirate. This change, however, is not admitted in ci-s and ci-tra, which are likewise demonstrative, and akin to ः ki;* and, in hic, may be promoted or occasioned by the accession of \( \varepsilon \), in order that like initial and final sounds may be avoided; as in Sanskrit, to prevent the recurrence of gutturals, these, in the syllable of reduplication, are weakened to palatals; hence चक्कार chakāra, "he made," for ka-kāra; and, according to the same principle, though anomalous, जाहि jahi, "kill ye," for hahi, from the root हन han. Thus also, in Latin, hic, hæc, hoc, for the less euphonious cie, cæc, coc. The final \( c \) is, I doubt not, an abbreviation of ce, which is again combined with itself in hicce; but ce, as also pe in quip-pe (from quid-pe), is only another form of que, by abandoning the euphonious affix \( V \). As, then, que, pe, quam and piam, which are all originally interrogative, when they are attached to an interrogative destroy its interrogative meaning, and give a different sense to the pronoun; so also the c of hic makes a similar change in it, and should therefore accompany this pronoun through all its cases, as it perhaps originally did. In the neuter hoc the case-sign makes way for the c, as hodec would be pro-

* Ci-tra is analogous with ul-tra, from ille, olle, suppressing le, and ci-s with ul-s, the s of which may be connected with the Greek locative suffix θι (πό-θι, &c.), to which it bears the same relation that δός does to δό-θι. Remark, that final i is suppressed in Latin almost universally.
nounced with difficulty. The interrogative meaning is similarly destroyed by the enclitic *uh* in Gothic, which is also identical in its origin with the *c* of *hic* or the *que* of *quisque.* And *hvazuh* (euphonic for *hvasuh*, [G. Ed. p. 578.]) actually signifies "quisque"; and after verbs *uh* means "and," e.g. *gaggith quithiduh, "ite diciteque"* (Marc. xvi. 7.); *yah bigêtun ina quélhunuh, "et invenerunt eum dixeruntque"* (Joh. vi. 25.). In *yah, "and," therefore (§. 385.), the copulative force may lie principally in the *uh*, which is abbreviated to *h*, and to which the preceding relative base serves only as the fulcrum; as, in Sanskrit, the particle व व, "or" (cf. Latin *ve*), which ought always to be subjoined, is attached, when prefixed, to यदि *yadi, "if," or तथा *atha, "then," which then lose their signification, like the Latin *si* in *sive*. As to the abbreviation, however, of *uh* to *h*, this regularly occurs in monosyllabic words terminating in a vowel; hence *hvd-h, "queaque,"* is the formal countertype of *hae-c*, just as *sva-h, "so,"* from *si-c* and *ni-h* ("and not," *nih-nih, "neither, nor"*), from *nec*. *Nauh, "yet," and *thauh, "but,"* form an exception, inasmuch as they ought to be divided *na-uh, tha-uh*, not *nau-h, thau-h*. It is clear, however, that, in Gothic, in these expressions the composition with *uh* has been lost sight of; they are obscurely transmitted from an ancient period of the language, and the separate elements of composition are no longer perceived in them. But regarded from the Gothic point of view, how is *uh* to be derived? I agree with Grimm in considering it as *hu* transposed, and connected with *hun*, which is likewise enclitic (III. 33.), and occurs almost only in negative sentences; so that *ni ainshun* and *ni hvashun* signify "not any one whatever." *Hun*, like the Latin *quam*, may be an accusative, but of the masculine gender, [G. Ed. p. 574.] as feminines in Gothic have generally lost the accusative

* Compare Grimm III. 23., where *uh* and the Latin *que* (= *qu*) are for the first time shewn to be identical.
sign. But if _hun_ be the accusative masculine it has lost the final _a_, which is added in Gothic to the original final nasal (§. 149.): in this respect it agrees with the adverbial pronominal accusatives _than_, “then,” &c., and _hvan_, “when?” “how?” Perhaps, however, _hun_ is only a contraction of the latter, by suppressing the _a_, and changing the _v_ into a vowel, just like the Latin _cujus_, _cui_, from _qVojus_, _qVo_ (§. 389.), and like _cum_ from _qVum_. But in the Gothic there was greater ground for this abbreviation, as _hun_ occurs only in composition, and must not therefore be too broad. The same applies to _uh_ as the transposition of _hu_, inasmuch as this is actually a contraction of the base _HVA_. The possibility, however, of a different derivation of _uh_ and _hun_ will be shewn subsequently (§. 398.)

396. To the Sanskrit-Zend interrogative base _ki_, and the Latin _QVI_, _HI_, and _CI_, the Gothic demonstrative base _HI_ corresponds; of this, however, as of the Latin _CI_, from which it is only distinguished by the legitimate transposition of sounds, but few derivatives remain, viz. the dative _himma_, and the accusative _hina_, as also the adverbial neuter accusative _hita_, which are used only with reference to time; _himma_ and _hita_ in the sense of “now,” and _himmadaga_, “on this day,” “to-day,” _hinadag_, “this day.” The adverb _hi-drē_, “hither,” is also a derivative from _HI_; and _hēr_, “here,” is likewise irregularly connected with it, being, with respect to its _r_, analogous to the _thar_ and _hvar_ mentioned at §. 381. A regular and undoubted derivative of the base _HI_, viz. _hir_, occurs in the compound _hir-yan_, “to descend”; in which, however, the pronominal expression has an accusative meaning, signifying direction to a place.

[G. Ed. p. 675.] On the Gothic accusative _hina_ is based the German _hin_, properly “to this or that (place),” which supplies the place of a preposition in compounds like _hingehen_, “adire.” Instead of the Gothic dative in _himmadaga_, the Old High German uses the instrumental _hiv_,
contained in hiutu, German heute, “to-day”—according to Grimm’s very satisfactory derivation, an abbreviated form of hiutagu—and which is found also in the Middle High German hiure, German heuer, “this year,” which presupposes an Old High German hiuru, and is evidently an abbreviation of hiu-yātru; for the Latin hornus cannot be considered as the root, but must itself be compounded of a demonstrative and an appellation of “year;” the age of which is shewn by the Zend (compare §. 391.). In Old High German, in combination with naht, “night,” we find the form hīnaht, Middle High German hīnaht, and hīnte, German heunt, for heint. I agree with Grimm in considering hī as an abbreviation of hīa, which must be supposed to exist as the accusative feminine; so that the suppression of the a is compensated by lengthening the i, which is short of itself. The base HI, therefore, is lengthened in the feminine in the same manner as, in Gothic, the base i (§. 363.), the feminine accusative of which, iya (euphonic for ia), coincides with the to-be-presupposed Old High German hīa, the nominative of which was probably hīu, in analogy with siu, accusative sia (§. 354.). This opinion is supported by the Anglo-Saxon and Old Frisian, which express “he,” by this pronoun, but, in the feminine, lengthen the base hi by the inorganic affix mentioned; thus, Old Frisian, hīu, “ea,” hīa, “eam”; and for the former, in Anglo-Saxon, hīo, and in the accusative hi, abbreviated from hīa. As, then, as appears from what has been said, the base HI refers principally to appellations of time, it may be observed that the Sanskrit had already furnished the example for this by its स्न ह्यस्, “yesterday,” from hi+as.

397. The Latin nē-hīl is to be mentioned [G. Ed. p. 576.] here, the l of which springs perhaps from the frequent corruption of d to l or r, a weakening which takes place especially in compounds, to prevent the whole word from becoming too ponderous. In this respect we may adduce the instance of
the number ten (दशन् dasan, déka), the d of which becomes r in Hindustani and Bengali, in the compound numerals eleven, twelve, &c. (p. 442), and l in Germanic and Lithuanian. If, then, nihil is a corruption of nihid, it then literally means "not something"; and may thus be compared with the Zend ἀνέκα naēchis, "none," "not any one," mentioned at § 390., the neuter of which, which I am unable to cite, can scarce be anything but ἀνέκα naēchis. From nihil, as in its change to l the inflexion is no longer perceived to be the case-sign, might easily come the lengthened form nihilum, and hilum, after removing the negation, and lengthening the vowel. The Sanskrit intensive particle विकत kila must also be mentioned, which has also probably proceeded from the pronominal base विक ki. And from this quarter must be further adduced विकतक्षण kila-s, "vacuum," the negative of which, विकतक्षण akhila, signifies "all," "whole," literally, "having nothing empty"; whence, by assimilation, may have arisen the German all, Gothic ells, theme ALLA, supposing it has not been formed by a reverse assimilation from ALYA, "alis." With regard to the Latin omnis, the conjecture has been already elsewhere expressed, that its o is a particular modification of the negative a, and minis may be an abbreviation of minus; so that o-minis would properly mean "having no minus," and would be based on the same ideal process as the Indian विकत akhila.

[G. Ed. p. 577.] 398. The reason that the Sanskrit मदकिस mdkis, नकिस nakis, mentioned at § 390., are, in Zend, corrupted to अनेकस māchis, अनेकस naēchis, may be this, that ch, as softer and weaker than k, is more suitable in forms encumbered by composition. The same explanation may be applied to the Sanskrit appended particle chit (for kit, § 390.), the use of which, in Zend, is more extensive, and which is there combined, amongst other words, with अनेकस katara, "uter," whence, in the nominative masculine, अनेकस kataraśchit (V. S. p. 40.), which, when con-
trasted with the Latin _utereque_ for _cutereque_, and the Gothic _hvataruh_, is clearly seen to be cognate in form, as in meaning. In Sanskrit, also, चित्र _chit_ removes from the interrogative expression preceding it its interrogative force, and forms _kaschit_, “any one,” “one,” from र क _ka-s_, “who?” and similarly in the other genders; and so _kaddchit_, “at any time,” _kathanchit_, “in any manner,” _kwachit_, “any where,” from _kadd_, “when?” _katham_, “how?” and _kwa_, “where?” And as the base _chit_ has proceeded from _ki_, in the same manner the enclitic च _cha_, which signifies “and,” “but,” and “for;” springs from the principal base _ka_, which therefore appears more corrupted in _cha_, than the Latin _QVO_ in the enclitic _que_. The Sanskrit च _cha_ is further combined with _na_, and forms चन _chana_, which is likewise enclitic, and occurs principally, if not solely, in negative sentences like the Gothic _hun_ mentioned above: _na kaschana_ signifies “_nullus_,” _na kadhchana_, “_nunquam_,” and _na kathanchana_, “_nullo modo_.” Hence the appended _na_ may be regarded both as the negation, and as strengthening what is expressed by the simple phrase. But by this चन _chana_ a derivation may be given to the Gothic _hun_, different from that furnished above (p. 558). It is certain that if the _u_ of _hun_ is not the vocalised _v_ of _hvos_, it can only have proceeded from an older _a_, whether from the influence of the liquid (§. 66.), or from the weight [G. Ed. p. 578.] of the vowel of the appended particle being lessened on account of the composition. But if _hun_ be identical with _chana_ from _kana_, I should also prefer regarding the _u_ of the appended particle _uh_ (p. 557), not as the solution of an older _v_, but as the weakened form of a prior _a_; and thus _uh_ from _hu_ might be compared with the Sanskrit _cha_ from _ka_.

399. As expressions, which occur chiefly in negative sentences, readily adopt, as it were, a negative nature, so that, even when the true element of negation is omitted, they obtain an independent negative force, as _e. g._ the French _rien_ by itself
signifies "nothing," and the Old High German nih-ein, "nullus," has, in the German kein, lost precisely that which is the element of negation; so we may suppose that, in the Old Northern expressions, before the enclitic ki or gi (Grimm III. 33.), a particle of negation originally existed. In the present state of the language, however, the said particle is of itself negative; e.g. eingi, "nullus," einski, "nullius," mangi, "nemo," manski, "neminis," vaetki, "nihil." I consider this particle to be a derivative of the old and widely-diffused interrogative base ki, which, by its being always subjoined to some other word, has been protected from the usual alteration of sound; so that, in the sense of §. 99., the old tenuis has been left unchanged after s, but the medial has been introduced after vowels and r.

400. With regard to what has been observed of the Old Sclovonic, §. 388., that its interrogative base ko occurs only in combination with the definite and originally relative pronoun, it must, however, be understood that KO, after the o is dropped, is combined also with the demonstrative base TO, since kto [G. Ed. p. 579.] signifies "quis," though to by itself is only neuter; and in the masculine nominative and accusative, as in all bases in o, this vowel is suppressed. In the oblique cases* kto abandons the demonstrative element, and appears as the simple base KO. Compare the genitive ko-go and dative ko-mâ with the Sanskrit ku-sya (§. 269.), ka-smâi. The instrumental kym follows the declension of the definite adjective (§. 284.), and is, therefore, not simple. The neuter is attached to the Sanskrit-Zend softened interrogative base chi, and is, in the nominative, chto, with the vowel of the base suppressed, as in the masculine kto. The oblique cases likewise drop the demonstrative element: the genitive is che-go

* With the exception of the accusative, which is the same as the nominative. This pronoun does not appear to be used in the plural, and the feminine, also, is wanting. Compare Kopitar's Glagolita, p. 59.
and che-so,* dative che-má, locative che-m, instrumental chi-m. These forms may be explained in two ways: either the e of che-go, &c., is a corruption of the i of the Sanskrit-Zend base chi, as the bases gosti and kosti (§. 280.) form, in the dative and locative plural, goste-m, goste-ch, koste-m koste-ch; or the original base chi has assumed, in Sclavonic, a second inorganic affix, and been lengthened to CHYO (compare §. 259.), from which, according to §. 255. n., must be formed chye or che, and then, by rejecting the final vowel, chi, as, §. 282., we have seen the base yo in several cases contracted to i. Compare, also, §. 280., the declension of the bases KNÝAYO and MORÝO.

401. There remains to be mentioned the Greek interrogative τίς, τίνος, and the indefinite τίς, τίνος. [G. Ed. p. 580.] The origin of both is, I have no doubt, similar, and they are derived from the bases ki and chi, which, in Sanskrit and Zend, have not only an interrogative signification, but, under certain circumstances, an indefinite one also. In Greek the old theme in i has been lengthened by the affix of a v; but, in regard to its τ, TIN has the same relation to chi and to the Latin QUI that τέσσαρες has to चत्वारस् chatvaras and quatuer, and that πέντε has to पच pancha and quinQUIE. Still I am not of opinion that the Greek τ in these forms has arisen from the ch of the cognate Asiatic languages, but that it has sprung directly from the orginal k, from which, at the time of the unity of language, ch had not as yet been developed, as this letter has, in the classical languages also, no existence, but was first formed in Italian from the Latin c (always =k) before e and i. But if k has been frequently changed into the labial tenuis, and thus IIØ has been formed

* This form, which formerly escaped me, is important, as testifying that the g of the common pronominal termination go has sprung from the s, and not from the semi-vowel of the Sanskrit termination sya (see §. 269).
from KO, πέμπε from the to-be-pre-supposed πέγκε, we may also see no difficulty in its occasional transition into the lingual tenuis, particularly as τ is the primary element of the Indian ch. But if τίς comes from κίς, and is akin to the Latin quis and Sanskrit ki-s and chi-t, then perhaps, also, the particle τε is connected with que and the corresponding χα cha (§. 398.), and has therefore sprung from κε, and is alien to the base of the article, which would be at variance with my former conjecture.*

402. Here may be mentioned, also, the Old Sclavonic enclitic particle she (κα), which signifies “but,” and has the effect of restoring to the pronoun ἰ, “he,” its original relative signification (§. 282.), for i-she signifies “which.” On the other hand, when combined with interrogatives, it removes, like the Latin que, their interrogative meaning; hence, ni chesoshe, “nihil,” “not of any thing.”† I consider this particle as identical with the Sanskrit χα cha, “and,” “but,” “for,” and with the Latin que, and therefore as a derivative from the interrogative base, the tenuis of which appears in this particle, as in the Greek γε and γαρ (§. 391.), to have descended to a medial. G in Sclavonic before e, however, is regularly changed, in several parts of grammar, into sh; as in the vocative singular, where, in bases in o, this vowel is weakened, as in Greek, to e (ε); but by the influence of this e the g preceding becomes sh, hence; boshe, “God!” from the base BOGO, nominative бογ, whence, also, boshii, “godlike.” I intentionally select this word as an example, since it is important to me to be able to compare it with an Indian appellation of the highest divinities: I think, that is to say, that the Sclavonic base BOGO is identical with the Sanskrit भगवत dhagavat, “the exalted, the worthy of veneration.”

† Kopitar’s Glossary, p. 86. Regarding cheso, see above, p. 563.
literally "gifted with happiness, power, splendor." This bhagavat, nominative bhagavdn, occurs principally as an appellation of Viṣṇu, e.g. in the episode of Sunda and Upasunda (III. 23.), and in the title of an episode of the Mahābhārata, Bhagavad-Gītā, i.e. "Song of the exalted," because it refers to Krishna, an incarnation of Viṣṇu. Referring to Brahmā and Viṣṇu, bhagavat is only used adjectively; thus Sunda and Upasunda III. 24. and IV. 23.: it comes from bhaga, with the suffix vat, in the strong cases vant; but bhaga comes from the root bhaj, "to venerate." The Slavonic base BOGO has dropped the derivative suffix of the Sanskrit bhagavat; but this appears in an abbreviated form, and with an inorganic affix, in bogat [G. Ed. p. 582.] (theme boyato), "rich," which, too, might be the meaning of bhagavat, as "gifted with fortune."

403. The same relation that, in an etymological respect, the Slavonic sh has to y, ch has to k, and springs from the latter according to the same rule by which g becomes sh, viz. before e; hence, tekū, "I run," in the second and third persons forms techeshi, techet, on the same principle by which mosheshi and moshet come from mogū, "I can." Although, then, above, at §. 400., we have seen the Sanskrit-Zend interrogative chi in the same form in Slavonic, or in that of che —che-go, "of whom?" chim, "by which?" chto, "what?" for che-to or chi-to—it is not requisite to assume that these forms brought the sound ch with them from the East, because there exists an interrogative chi there also; but in the Slavonic and its Asiatic cognate idioms the weakened ch might have arisen independently from the old guttural, which, perhaps, alone existed at the time of their identity; and in the Slavonic, according to a phonetic law which has been given, an interrogative form che would have proceeded from ki or kya, though in Sanskrit and Zend a base chi never existed.
DERIVATIVE PRONOMINAL ADJECTIVES.

404. By the suffix ka are formed, in Sanskrit, māmaka, "meus," and tāvaka, "tuus," from the genitives of the personal pronouns, mama, tava, with the vowel of the first syllable lengthened. To these the Vedic plural possessives are analogous; asmāka, "our," yuṣhmāka, "your," from which we have seen the plural genitives of the personal pronouns [G. Ed. p. 583.] asmākam, yuṣhmākam, formed. Perhaps, as Rosen conjectured,* these forms spring from the personal ablatives asmat, yuṣhmat, so that the suppression of the t is made up by lengthening the preceding vowel. It must here be observed, that, as has been already repeatedly remarked, the t of the nominative and accusative singular neuter of pronouns of the third person, as also that of the ablative singular and plural of pronouns of the first and second persons, is so far used as a theme by the language, that it is retained at the beginning of compounds, where otherwise we find the mere base (compare §. 357.); and that several derivative words have proceeded from the form in t, whether the T sound has been actually retained in them (§. 405.), or replaced by lengthening the vowel preceding. On the Vedic asmāka, "our," is based the Zend aṃṣaṃvam ahmāka, whence V.S. p. 30, the instrumental aṃṣaṃvam ahmākāis. I am unable to cite the possessive of the singular, and of the second person, as the use of possessives in Zend, as in Sanskrit, is very rare, because they are generally supplied by the genitives of the personal pronouns.

405. In Sanskrit, possessives are formed with the suffix ṭya, from the ablative singular and plural of pronouns of the first and second person, and from the neuter tat of the third person; also from sarva, "every," the a of which is rejected before the suffix ṭya, while t is changed before it into d;

* In the place quoted at p. 473.
hence madiya, “mine,” from mat; twadiya, “thine,” from twat; asmadiya, “our,” from asmat; yushmadiya, “your,” from yushmat; tadiya, “belonging to him, to this man, or belonging to her, to this woman,” from tat.* An analogous formation is, I think, to be found in the Greek [G. Ed. p. 584.] ἰδιος, whether it belongs to the demonstrative base ἴ,† and the ἴ preceding the ἴος be identical with the Sanskrit it (before sonant letters id), contained in नेत्र नेत्र, and चेत् chēt, and the Latin id; or whether—and this conjecture I prefer—the breathing has been softened, and ἰδιος for ἰδιος belong to the reflexive (§. 364.); with regard to which it may be remarked, that the cognate Sanskrit स्व तर, “his,” signifies, also, “own,” and can be applied to all three persons. There does not, indeed, exist, in Sanskrit, a pronoun of the third person devoid of gender, with a perfect declension, but only the remains of one, स्वयम् swayam, “self,” and, in Prākrit, से seh (for स्वे) “sui” (§. 341.). There is, however, every reason for supposing that स्व swa, as a personal pronominal base, did possess a complete declension analogous to the pronouns of the first and second person. Its ablative must, therefore, have been स्वत् swat; and thence might have arisen swatīya, “suus,” analogous to madiya, twadiya, and a cognate form to त्रि for त्रि, from स्वाद्य स्वाद्य; like रेप, from स्वाद्य, corresponding to the Sanskrit स्वेद swēda, and the German Schweiss, “sweat”; and छेत्र, छेद, from स्वाद्य = Sanskrit स्वाद्य swādus. In regard to form, the correlatives ποιος, ποιος, φοι, which appear to have lost a middle ṣ, agree with the possessives in इय इय: in other respects, ποιος answers tolerably well to tadiya-ς, which has not only a possessive, but also a clear demonstrative meaning.†

* Compare Hartung On the Cases, p. 117.
† Tadiya occurs, also, in the sense of its primitive; so Raghuvansa, according to Stenzler I. 81., and Brockhaus’s Pātaliputra, Sl. 2. The possessive signification occurs at Raghuvansa II. 28.
The Sclavonic possessives are based on the Sanskrit [G. Ed. p. 585.] in iva, but have dropped the i of this suffix, and the T sound of the primitive pronoun. According to §. 257. ya must become yo, and according to §. 255. n., yo becomes ye or e: the latter is the form assumed; and in those cases which are uninflected, and at the same time deprived of the final vowel of the base, the y has become i, as always takes place after vowels: hence moï, "meus," moïa, "meu," moe, "meum," corresponding to the Sanskrit ma-dïya-s, madïya, madïya-m. And in the second person, tvoï, tvoïa, tvoe, bears the same relation to twadïya-s, twadïya, twadïya-m; and the possessive third person, svoï, svoïa, svoe, presupposes, like the Greek iðios—if this stands for iðios—a Sanskrit swadïya. It appears that these possessives have been transmitted to the Sclavonic from the ancient period of the language, and are, as it were, the continuance of the Sanskrit forms; for if they were originally Sclavonic we should then find in them the same corruption of the base of the primitive pronouns that we have before remarked in those pronouns. The possessives would then most probably be, in the nominative masculine, meny or mny, teby, seby, or toby, soby; but no case of the personal pronouns would lead us to expect moï, still less tvoï, svoï. In Lithuanian, on the contrary, the possessives mána-s, láva-s, sáwa-s, are comparatively of quite recent date, for they agree with the particular modification of personal bases in the oblique cases singular (see §§. 340. 342.): thus, in Latin, meus, tuus, suus, probably from mei, tui, sui; and in Greek, ἐμός, σος, ὄς, are, in their theme, identical with that from which proceed ἐμοῖ, ἐμοί, σοῖ, σοί, ὄι, ὄι. On the other hand, σφῶς, σφύς, σφῶν, is the exact countertype of the Sanskrit swa-s, swā, swa-m, which affords the oldest example of possessives without any affix expressing the possession; for swa is purely personal in its form, and, as has been already observed, the [G. Ed. p. 586.] theme of स्वयम् swayam, "self." (§. 341.).
The formation of possessives in the plural numbers by the comparative suffix is peculiar to the Greek and Latin; but this suffix is not extraordinary in possessives, which prominently contrast the person or persons possessing with those not possessing, and thus contain a duality, which the comparative suffix in pronouns is adapted to express.

407. The Lithuanian plural possessives are musiszkis, "our," yusiszkis, "your," the theme of which terminates in kia (§ 135.), and reminds us of the Sanskrit possessives in ka; viz. asmàka, yùshmàka. It is certain that the syllable si in muSiškis, yuSiškis, is connected with the appended pronoun śma (compare §. 335.); but we shall leave undecided the origin of the sz (= sh) which precedes the k. The Old Sclavonic forms the plural possessives nas, vas, from the genitives of the personal pronouns, by the same suffix, which we have noted in mořt, tvořt, svôřt, only with the necessary phonetic difference; hence nashý, "our," vashý, "your,"* genitive nashego, vashego. With this suffix, the interrogative forms, in Sclavonic, also a possessive, viz. chít, "belonging to whom?" feminine chìya, neuter chie. It belongs to the Sanskrit weaker base ki, which we have already noticed in chego, chim, &c. (§. 400.). As to the weakening of the k to ch, we must refer to what has been said on this subject at §. 403.

408. The Germanic possessives are most intimately connected with the genitives of the personal pronouns, and are identical with them in their theme (p. 474). If it be assumed that, in the genitive plural, the forms unsara, izvara, like the Latin nostri, vestri, nostrum, vestrum, and the Sanskrit asmàkam, yùshmàkam, are of possessive origin, the r may then be very satisfactorily explained as the

* Written also without y, nash, vash. The change of the s to sh is the consequence of the euphonic influence of the y, or, in the oblique cases, of the e (Dobrowsky, pp 39, 41).
weakening of the $d$ of the Sanskrit $asmadiya$, “our,” $yushmadiya$, “your.” Observe what has been remarked at p. 441 regarding an original $d$ becoming $r$ in a similar case, and, moreover, the circumstance that, in Hindústání also, the $d$ of the possessives under discussion has become $r$; hence, méra, méri, “meus,” “mea,” for मद्रीय madiya, मद्रीया madiyā. The dual genitives, $ugkara$, $igqvara$, and the dual possessive bases of the same sound, the singular nominatives masculine of which are $ugkar$, $igqvar$, are, according to what has been remarked at §. 169., originally only different modifications of plural forms, and their $r$, therefore, is founded on the same principle with that of the plural number. If we are to suppose that the singular genitives meina, theina, seina, have proceeded from possessive bases of the same sound, we should then have to assume a weakening of the medial to the nasal of the same organ, as, in general, an interchange between medials and nasals of the same organ is not unusual. But as to the formation, in New High German, of an inorganic possessive, foreign to the old dialects—viz. ihr, “ejus (feminae) proprius,” and “eorum or earum proprius,” from the feminine genitive singular and the genitive plural of the pronoun of the third person, which is common to all the genders—this circumstance affords no proof that the genuine and original possessives also have sprung from the genitive of the personal pronouns; but only shews that it is agreeable to the use of language to form possessive adjectives from the personal genitives.

[Г. Ed. p. 588.] 409. The forms corresponding in sense to the Greek correlates, πό-σος, τό-σος, ὃ-σος, are, in Sanskrit and Zend, those with the derivative suffix vant, in the weak cases vat (§. 129.), before which an $a$ final of the primitive base is

lengthened,* perhaps as compensation for the dropping of
the T sound of the neuter, which probably forms the
foundation and theme of these forms (compare §. 404.); hence तत्वन tāvant, nominative masculine तत्वान tāvān, rōs, यावन yāvant, nominative masculine यावान yāvān, ēros. From the interrogative base ka, or the lost neuter kat, we might expect कावन, which would serve as prototype to the Latin quantus, and would bear that relation to it, which तत्वन tāvant does to tantus. In the Latin tantus, quantus, therefore, a whole syllable is rejected, as in malo, from mavolo; but externally the theme is lengthened, in analogy with the Pāli participial forms mentioned at pp. 300, 301; thus tantus for tāvantus, and the latter for tāvans. The quantity of the a of quantus, tantus, on account of its position, cannot be discovered: the a, however, appears to spring from an originally long ā, inasmuch as from a short ś a probably ē or ō would be evolved, as in tot, quot, answering to तति tati, अति katī, of which hereafter. In Gothic, the suffix शन्त vanīt is corrupted in three ways; first in consequence of the easy mutation and interchange of the semi-vowels;† secondly through the no-less-frequent vocalization of the nasal to u;‡ and lastly by extending the theme with a, [G. Ed. p. 589.]

* In Zend the long has relapsed into the short vowel, as very frequently occurs in the antepenultimate.

† §. 20. Compare, also, the Gothic ślēpa, “I sleep,” with the Sanskrit श्लेपि ślepī; the Latin laudo with लादू vand, “to praise”; and the Lithuanian saludē-s, Old Sclavonic saldok (p. 412, Note *), “sweet,” with the Sanskrit सादुस svādu-s. With respect to the interchange of v and r, in which the Old High German birumēs, as contrasted with the Sanskrit भवामस bhavāmas, “we are,” affords us a very interesting comparison, and one which has been since established by Graff (II. 325.), we will here remind the reader of the relation of the Gothic razn, “house” (theme razna, with z euphonic for s, according to §. 86. (5),) to the Sanskrit root वस vās “to inhabit,” whence व्यास vāsra, “house,” which Piktet recognises in the Irish fōsra (Journ. As. III Serie, T. II. p. 443).

‡ See §§. 236. 255. g. and 307.
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which, however, in accordance with § 135, is suppressed in the nominative. In the first and last respect LAUDA coincides very remarkably with the form which, in Latin, the suffix वत vant assumes, or may assume, where it does not form pronominal correlatives, but possessive adjectives, as opulentus (with the more organic opulens), virulentus, &c. The long vowel required in Sanskrit before the suffix vant, where it forms correlatives, is retained in the Gothic hvédlaus, "quantus," the old ā (§ 69.) being supplied by ē; whence it appears as if the instrumental hvē were contained in hvē-lauds. We should expect a demonstrative thēlaus, τόσος, as corresponding to hvēlaus, πόσος, analogous to the Sanskrit तत्वन्त tāvant and Latin tāntus: this thēlaus, however, is rendered superfluous by a svalauds, formed from the original base of the genderless pronoun of the third person (comp. § 341.), which, however, has not preserved the original long vowel.

410. The derivative kāvāt, from the Sanskrit interrogative base ka, which is wanting, is supplied by kiyant, from the base ki; analogous to which is इयून्त iyant, "so much," from the demonstrative base i. I conjecture इयून्त kiyant [G. Ed. p. 590.] and इयून्त iyant to be abbreviations of kīvant and ēvant, formed by suppressing the v; after which, in accordance with a universal phonetic law,† the preceding i must become iy. This conjecture is supported by the Zend, in so far as the interrogative form under discussion has retained the full suffix vant: instead of this, however, an abbreviation has taken place in the base, by suppressing the i and weakening the k to च ch, hence in the nominative

* We must avoid referring the u to the suffix: it is clearly the final vowel of the primitive word, which, however, through the influence of the liquid, appears in the form of u (compare Vocalismus, p. 162, Note *).
† Gram. Crit. § 51.
masculine च्वानिः, accusative च्वांतेः. To the Sanskrit relative यावंत corresponds यावंतः यावंति of which, however, I am unable to quote any case in the masculine, and only the neuter यावत and the feminine यावतिः. The former occurs tolerably often; the latter I am acquainted with only through a passage given by Burnouf,† where, in the lithographed codex (V.S. p. 83), यावत्तिः occurs, through an error, for यावतिः.‡ The तावंत which answers to [G. Ed. p. 591.] the above interrogative and relative expressions, appears to be wanting in Zend, as in Gothic, and is supplied by analogous derivatives from other demonstrative bases; viz. by अवावंत from अवा, and अवांत from अ. The latter forms, in the masculine nominative, not अवानिः, according to the analogy of च्वानिः, “how much?” and ठुवानिः, “as thou,” but अवांत अवादो, which I agree with Burnouf || in explaining by supposing that the न्त has given

* च्वानिः अवावंत च्वांतेः च्वांतेः पाश्चाल्ता जूर्वनेः, “after how much time?” (Vend. S. p. 229). The nominative च्वानिः occurs Vend. S. p. 86. From the primitive base चि I have still to mention here the neuter चित्, of which only the enclitic use, whereby the interrogative meaning is removed, has been mentioned before. But as representing the more common कै it occurs l. c. p. 80, चित्य चित्य चित्य चित्य अवात वाचो, “what (is) that word?”

† Often occurs adverbially, e. g. चित्य चित्य अवात अन्तरे नारेः, “among how many men?” (Vend. S. p. 30).

‡ याचना, Note A., p. 12.

§ We should notice also here the expression चितस्य फ्राठो (with चित्, चितस्य फ्राठस्य-चित्), since it shews that the रि, which is retained full in the Sanskrit प्रिथु, is an abbreviation of the syllable रा which is also pointed out by the Greek πλαρύς. I think I have sufficiently proved, in my Vocalismus (Rem. 1. p. 156, &c.), that the Sanskrit vowel रि, in all places, an abbreviation of a syllable, which contains the consonant र before or after a vowel.

|| याचना, Note A., p. 11.
place before the nominative sign ı; and has been supplied by the lengthening of the a to ȳ; which latter, with the final sibilant, must produce the diphthong ďō (§. 56b.).

411. The Lithuanian idant, which signifies "that" and "thoroughly," is most probably a remnant of the forms which terminate, in Sanskrit and Zend, in vant, and in Latin in ntu-s; and, indeed, in the d of iDant, the neuter case-termination appears to be retained, which is replaced in the cognate Asiatic languages by lengthening the preceding vowel: the syllable ya of the relative base has, then, been contracted to i. The pronominal origin of this idant is shown by its signification "that," and also particularly by the circumstance that other terms also for this conjunction have sprung, both in Lithuanian itself and in the cognate languages, from the relative base under discussion; viz. yeib (§. 383.), in the sense of ut, Sanskrit ya-thā, Greek ὁς, Gothic ei (§. 365.), and yōg, in the sense of quod, Sanskrit yat, Greek ὥσ. The secondary idea of multitude, expressed in Sanskrit, Zend, and Latin, by the formations in vant, is represented in idant by the signification "thoroughly." From the particular case of the Lithuanian language, however, we could scarcely argue

[G. Ed. p. 582.] the possibility of a connection between the suffix ant of id-ant, and that of kieli, "how many?" Kieli is a masculine plural nominative, according to the analogy of geri from GERA: the theme, therefore, is KIELA, and, for a few cases, KIELIA (see p. 251, Note ḩ); and la the derivative suffix, which admits of being regarded as an abbreviation of va-nt, with a similar exchange of v and l, as we have seen above in the Gothic hwēlauds. This conjecture is strongly supported by kielēts, which likewise means "how much?" but is so limited in its use that it can only be applied to living beings. Every letter of the Sanskrit suffix vat (the theme of the weak cases) is represented in this kielĒTS, and we even find an interrogative expression, in which the ṇ also of the strong form वनं vant is contained;—I mean
kolinta-s, "der wievielste?" "the how manyeth?"* with ta as ordinal suffix (§. 321.), probably, therefore, for kolint-tas; so that kolint, "how many?" by adding ta-s, becomes the "how manyeth?" But to return to id-ant, its suffix ant has lost only the v of the original vant; but la, the suffix of kielii, has retained the v in the form of l, and lost, in place of it, the final nt. There is, however, no demonstrative tieli corresponding to kielii, but "so many" is expressed by tiek or tiekas,† which has also a corresponding interrogative kiek.

The suffix of these forms appears connected with that of tokis or toks (theme tokia), "such," and koks, "what kind of one?"

412. Though at §. 409. we commenced with the comparison of the Greek correlatives πόσος, τόσος, δόσος, we must not, therefore, suppose that the Greek suffix ΞΟ is identical with the Sanskrit vant, and those related to it in the cognate languages. The transition of T into Σ, as also [G. Ed. p. 593.] the affix of an O, would not be extraordinary; but as the vowel of the pronominal base is originally long in this derivative, the retention of this long vowel would be to be expected in Greek; and the rather, as most probably the dropping of the initial sound of the suffix vant would have found a compensation in the preceding syllable, even if this had not been naturally long from the first. A form like τόσος might be regarded as identical with the Sanskrit tāvant; but τόσος appears to me, with reference to its final element, as of a different origin, and I would rather recognise in it the Zend shva, which forms words like अःत्री doṣa, "a third," अःथ्रिशवa chathrushva, "a quarter," and is identical with the Sanskrit swa-s, "swus." From स्वत्र swa-s, which, when uncompounded, has become ोś or σφός, hardly any thing

* It seems surprising that there should be no word in English for wievielste. "Who of the number?" expresses quite a different idea. I have been obliged, therefore, to coin a word.—Translator's Note.

† Tiek, substantive and indeclinable tieka-s adjective, feminine tieka.
but ςς could arise in the preceding compounds; and πς-ςς would, according to this view, originally signify "what part?" or, as possessive compound, "having what part?" from which the meaning "how much?" is not far removed.* Nevertheless, if what has been before said (§ 352.) regarding the origin of τηςςςς, ηςς, is well founded, there are not wanting in Greek points of comparison with the pronominal formations in vαντ or vατ. In Sanskrit the adverbial neuter accusative तावत् tαvαt signifies, amongst other things, also [G. Ed. p. 594.] "now," "at this time"; and the relative adverb यावत् yαvαt, also, which serves as prototype to the Greek ημς, is used principally with reference to time, and signifies "how long?" "while," "how often?" "how far?" "up to," and "that." It may be cited in the first sense from a passage in the Nalah (V. 23.):

![Greek text]

As it frequently happens that one and the same word is divided into several forms, of which each represents one of the meanings which formerly co-existed in the one original form, so may also τες and ης be identical with tαvαt and yαvαt; so that the digamma, which has been hardened above to μ, has been here, as usually happens, entirely dropped, but the quantities have been transposed; thus ης

---

* To these formations most probably Ιςς, also, belongs, which originally must have signified "so great," whence the meaning "equal" might easily arise. I formerly thought it might be assigned to the demonstrative base i (Demonstrative Bases, p. 8): as, however (which was there overlooked), it has a digamma, it would be better referred to the reflexive base, and compared with the Sanskrit aςι (§ 364.; and see Pott's Etymol. Forsch. p. 272).
for ἡ(Ὁ)ος, τέως for τῆ(Ὁ)ος. But it is probable that the first syllable has been shortened through the influence of the vowel following; and this weakening, and the abbreviation caused by dropping the digamma, have been compensated by lengthening the syllable following. The common adverbs in ως, also, of which an account has been given at §. 183., have operated by their example on ἔως, τέως. For the rest there exists a form τεῖος, as well as τέως, τείως.

413. Perhaps the Sclavonic pronominal adverbs in mo may also be classed here, which express direction to a place (Dobr. p. 430): ka-mo, “whither?” ta-mo, “thither.” The relative yamo is wanting, which would coincide with the Sanskrit यत् yāvat, “how far?” in the signification “therein,” since the former word likewise expresses the direction to which movement is made. As to the relation in form of the suffix mo to वत् vat, the t in Sclavonic, like all original final consonants, must necessarily disappear (§. 255. l.), and a in Sclavonic becomes o or [G. Ed. p. 595.] e almost universally; but to the long ḍ, which, in Sanskrit, precedes the derivative suffix, the Sclavonic a corresponds according to rule (§. 255. a.): thus ta-mo, answers to the Indian ta-vat, with m for v, as in the Greek adverbs of time ἡμος, τῆμος, above mentioned. If an origin for the Sclavonic suffix mo, different from that here assigned, be sought for, the appended pronoun स्मा sma might be next adduced, which drops the s in Sclavonic. But to take the demonstrative as an example, to the Sanskrit dative ta-smā́, and locative ta-smī́n, correspond, in Sclavonic, to-mú, to-m; and all that is left to find is an analogous form in Sclavonic to the ablative तस्मात् ta-smā́t. But the ablative is most opposed in meaning to the adverbs in mo, expressing direction to a place; and, as regards form, we could only expect for तस्मात् ta-smā́t, a form toma or tomo, and not ta-mo. For as the Sanskrit short a, at the end of old Sclavonic bases always becomes o (§. 257.), an unweakened
a, in this sole case, cannot but appear surprising; and there appears no reason why ta-mo should differ from the analogy of to-mā and to-m. There only remains one other possible means of deriving adverbs in mo, viz. by supposing mo to be a more full form of the plural dative termination; so that, of the Sanskrit termination भया bhyas, Latin bus, Lithuanian mus or ms (see §. 215.), which elsewhere, in Slavonic, has become mere m, in the case before us a vowel also is retained. If this opinion be the true one, kamo, "whither?" tamo "thither," inamo, "to somewhere else," onamo, "to that quarter," and similar forms, must be assigned to the feminine gender. Tamo, therefore, would

[G. Ed. p. 596.] correspond to the Sanskrit tābhyaś; while tyem, which is identical with the masculine and neuter, belongs to the compound base त य a (p. 499 G. ed.). This last derivation appears particularly supported by the consideration, that, in all probability, the adverbs of quantity in ma or mi (Dobr. p. 430) contain plural case-terminations, and those in mi the instrumental; those in ma an unusual and more full form of the dative termination, in which the old a of the bhyas above mentioned is retained, by which it becomes similar to the dual-termination given at §. 273. It appears to me, however, inadmissible to look for a real dual inflexion in the adverbs under discussion. Examples are: kolyma or kolymi, "how much?" tolyma or tolymi,* "so much." All these adverbs, however, have the syllable ly (from li) in the middle; and this, in my opinion, expresses the secondary idea of multitude, and is an abbreviation of the suffix liko, nominative masculine lik, e.g. kolik, "quantus," of which more hereafter. From this KOLIKO come, I imagine, the adverbs kolyma and kolymi, as, in Sanskrit, the plural instrumental शनिस sandis, expresses

* See Kopitar's Glossary to the Glagolita. Dobrowsky gives merely tollya.
the adverb “slowly,” but does not occur in its own proper signification, i.e. “through the slow.” There are also adverbs of quantity in Sclavonic which end in ly, without the case-terminations ma or mi; thus koly, “how much?” toly, “so much.” With these are also probably connected the adverbs of time in lye, which prefix to the pronoun the preposition do or ot, e.g. do-kolye, “how long?” ot-tolye, “so long.”

414. By the suffix ति ti is formed, in Sanskrit, जति kati, “how much?” from ka; तति tati, “so much,” from ta; and the relative जति yati, “as much,” from ya. The first two expressions are easily recognised in the Latin quot and tot, which, like the personal terminations of [G. Ed. p. 597.] verbs, have lost the final i. The full form is preserved, however, in compounds with dem, die, dianus; thus, toti-dem (not from tot-itidem), quoti-die, quoti-dianus. The length of the i of quoti-die, and of its derivative quoti-dianus, is inorganic, and perhaps occasioned by quoti appearing, by a misapprehension, as an ablative. But to return to the Sanskrit kati, tati, yati, these expressions, in a certain measure, prepare the way for the indeclinable cognate forms in Latin, as in the nominative and accusative they have no case-termination, but a singular neuter form, while in the other cases they exhibit the regular plural inflexions. In this respect they agree with the numerals from 5—10, which have become quite indeclinable in Greek and Latin likewise, as is quatuor, in the latter language, also (§. 313.). In Zend, kati frequently occurs after the masculine relative plural, and with a regular plural termination, viz. जश्वस्मम् जश्व katiyod, which signifies quicunque.

415. Nearly all pronouns are combined in Sanskrit with the adjectives द्रिष्टि dris, द्रिष्टि driśa, द्रिग driksha, which spring from the root dris, “to see,” and signify “appearing,” “like”; but, as they do not occur either isolated or in combination, have completely assumed the character of derivative
The final vowels of the pronominal bases, and of the compound plural themes asma and yushma, are lengthened before them, probably to make up for the loss of a T sound of the neuter of pronouns of the third person and of the ablative of the first and second person singular and plural (comp. §. 404.); hence, tà-driś (nominative tàdrik), or tà-driśa, or tà-drikśha, “to this like,” “such,” “talis,” for tad-driś, &c.; kī-driś, kī-driśa, kī-drikśha, “qualis”? for [G. Ed. p. 598.] kid-driś, &c.; yā-driś, yā-driśa, yā-drikśha, “qualis,” (relative); mā-driś, mā-driśa, mā-drikśha, “to me like,” “my equal”; asmādriś, &c., “to us like”; yuṣhmādriś, &c., “to you like.” From the demonstrative base i, or rather from the neuter it, which is not used uncompounded, comes ṭdriśa, &c., “talis”: from the subjective demonstrative base sa comes sadriś, &c., which, according to its origin, signifies “resembling this,” “appearing like this,” but is used to express in general what is “similar.” But the reason that there is no form sādriś, according to the analogy of tàdriś, &c., is clearly this—that this form springs from the real base sa, and a neuter sat was not used. It is not therefore, requisite to assume, with the Indian grammarians, that sadriś is an abbreviation of sama-driś, though, perhaps, from sama a form sama-driś might proceed, as from sa the form sadriś. The European cognate languages have, in remarkable agreement with one another, exchanged the old d for l in these combinations; independently, however, of each other, and simply because the interchange between d and l or r is much used,* and weakened sounds in forms encumbered

* See §. 17., where, amongst others, the Gothic leik is compared with the Sanskrit dēha. If the Gothic expression also means “flesh,” it may be observed here, that a word which, in Sanskrit, means simply “flesh,” appears in Old High German as a term for the body; while in Lithuanian and Slavonic the “flesh” has become “blood.” In form the nearest approach
by composition are readily introduced. In this way -λίκος has become so far estranged from the verb δέρκω, that we should have failed to perceive their common origin without the means of comparison afforded by the cognate Sanskrit. We must here again notice a similar fate [G. Ed. p. 599.] which has befallen the old ḍ of the number “Ten” in several Asiatic and European-Sanskrit languages at the end of compounds (p. 442). And in the preceding case we meet with a concurrent phenomenon in the East; for in Prākrit, in the compound under discussion, we frequently find r—which, according to §. 20., is often the precursor of l—instead of the Sanskrit ḍ; e.g. तारिस tārīsa, together with तादिस tādisa, for ताद्रिस tādriṣa.* The Doric ταλίκος closely resembles tārīsa. The i of both languages, however, springs, not from the Sanskrit ṍ, for this is an abbreviation of ar,† the a of which, in Prākrit and Greek, has been weakened to i, while the r is dislodged entirely. While λίκος is based on the Sanskrit द्रिषा, nominative masculine द्रिषा-s, the pure radical द्रिष्ठ द्रिष्ठ, nominative masculine, feminine, and neuter द्रिष्ठ, is also represented in Greek, viz. by ἱνυς and ὑμηλυς. The Prākrit kērīsa resembles the interrogative πηλίκος very closely; but it must not be overlooked, that the Prākrit ᖌ is

approach to the Sanskrit kravya-m, “flesh,” is the Lithuanian krauva-s, Sclovonic kroby, “blood”; next comes the Old High German base HREWA, nominative hrēo, “body,” which preserves the original form more truly than the Greek κρέας and Latin caro.

* In my first discussion on this subject I was unacquainted with the resemblance of the Prākrit to its cognate European languages (see Influence of Pronouns on the Formation of Words, pp. 8 and 27). Since then Max. Schmidt, also (De Pron. Gr. et Lat. p. 72), has shewn the agreement of the Sanskrit formations in द्रिषा-s with the Greek, Gothic, and Latin, in λίκος, leik-s, and li-s. But he overlooks, in the Sanskrit forms, the long vowel of the pronominal base, on which is based the Greek ὑ, more anciently ὃ, and Latin ā, whence it is not requisite to make the adverbs ὑ, ἔ, ὑ, the basis of the said formations.

† §. 1. and Vocalismus, Rem. 1.
a corruption of ἕ, * while πηλίκος stands for παλίκος, and is based, not on the Sanskrit kādriśa-s, but on a kādriśa-s to be 

[G. Ed. p. 600.] expected from the base ka, and which probably originally existed, to which, also, the Gothic hvēleiks belongs.

416. In the hvēleiks (theme hvēleika) just mentioned, with which the German welcher, "which," is connected, as also in hvēlauds (§. 409.), the Gothic has retained the vowel length, which is thousands of years old, with this difference only, that ē is replaced by ē, a circumstance of rare occurrence (§. 69.). There is no demonstrative thēleiks corresponding to hvēleiks, but instead of it svaleiks, German solcher, "such," like svalauds for thēlauds (§. 409.); but the Anglo Saxon and Old Northern employ thylic, thilkr, corresponding to the Greek τηλίκος and Sanskrit tādriśa-s (Grimm III. 40.). The Gothic leiks, "similar," however, occurs also in combinations other than the ancient pronominal ones; never, however, by itself, but instead of it is used ga-leiks, our gleich, from ge-leich, which may be looked upon as the continuation of the Sanskrit sādriśa-s mentioned above: for as the inseparable preposition स sa, सम sam, has, in Gothic, become ga (Grimm II. 1018.), so may also the pronominal base, from which those prepositions have sprung, be expected as prefix in the form of ga. In analeiks, † German ähnlich, "like," ana, in my opinion, stands, in like manner, as a pronoun, not as a preposition, and answers to the Sanskrit-Lithuanian demonstrative base ana (§. 372.): ana-leiks therefore signifies "to this like." In the other compounds, also, of this kind, with the exception of manleika (theme -leikan), "likeness," literally "man-resembling," the first member of the word corresponds more or less to a pronominal idea. These compounds are antharleikei, "variety," which pre-supposes an adjective antharleiks, as

---

* Hoefer De Prákrita Dialecto, p. 29.
† To be deduced from the adverb analeikō.
connected in sense with the Sanskrit anyā-drisa-s, “to another like,” “of a different kind,” whence alyaleiks, deducing it from alyaleikos, ἐτέρως, which pre-supposes an adjective samaleik(a)-s, “to the same like,” analogous to the Greek ὁμολογίς and Latin similis. * ibnaleiks, “equal,” like the simple ibn(a)-s; according to its origin, the former signifies “seeming equal”: missaleiks, “various.” I cannot avoid expressing here the conjecture that the Gothic prefix missa, German miss, may be of pronominal origin, and connected with the Lithuanian base WISSA, nominative wissa-s, “all,” and therefore also with the Sanskrit विस्व viśwa, by the very common exchange of v for m (§. 63.). According to the explanation given above (§. 392.) of विस्व viśwa, this word, through the signification of the preposition विव vi, would be very well adapted to express the idea of variety. And the Gothic missa (the bare theme) might originally have signified alius, and still be identical with the Sanskrit-Lithuanian term for “all”; at least its influence in composition is similar to the German aber, which is akin to the Sanskrit apara, “alius” (see §. 350.), in compounds like Aberwitz, “delirium,” Aberglaube, “superstition.” The German Misses that, therefore, Gothic missadēds, “misdied,” would be =Aber-That, “a deed different from the right”; and Missgunst, “ill-will,” would be Aber-gunst, “wrong-will”; and the missaleiks given above would originally signify “to other like.” This conjecture is powerfully supported, and confirmed almost beyond doubt, by the adverb missō, which springs from the theme MISSA (compare p. 384), which signifies “one another”: gōleith ixvis missō, [G. Ed. p. 602.]

* The simple sama (theme saman) means “the same,” and corresponds to the Sanskrit sama-s, “equal,” “similar,” and Greek ὁμοι-ς, the theme being lengthened by an n. To this head, also, must be referred sums (theme suma), “any one,” which has introduced a u on account of the liquid, but to make up for this has dropped the n.
PRONOUNS.

ἀσπάσασθε ἀλλήλους (1 Cor. xvi. 20). The original meaning "all" is still perceptible in this, as missē, in one word, expresses "the one and the other." In German, the lich, which is based on the Gothic leiks,* and which in welcher and solcher has dropped the i, and in gleich gives, according to rule, ei as answering to the old i, is much more extensively diffused, and has completely assumed the character of a derivative suffix in words like jährlich, "yearly," jämmerlich, "lamentable," glücklich, "fortunate," schmerzlich, "painful," &c.† The occurrence of the simple word in Northern, Anglo-Saxon, and English, may be explained by its being formed by abbreviating the Gothic galeiks, our gleich, by removing the entire prefix.

417. An objection against the identity of the Gothic suffix leika and Greek λίκος could hardly be raised from the non-mutation of sound in the middle tenuis. I refer the reader, on this head, to §. 89., for example to the connection of the Gothic slēpa and Old High German insuepiu with the Sanskrit swapimi, Latin sopio, and Greek ὑπόκος, in spite of the retention of the old tenuis. The long i (in Gothic written ei) in the Germanic formation, answering to the short i in the Greek λίκος, and Prákrit risa or disa, will still less be a ground for rejecting the identity of the suffix under discussion in the three languages; for as the original form is darka (see p. 598 G. ed.), the rejection of the r may well have been compensated by lengthening the preceding vowel; and the Germanic, therefore, in this respect, approaches the original form one degree closer than the cognate Hellenic and Prákrit idiom.

[Gr. Ed. p. 603.] 418. The Old Sclavonic exhibits our suffix exactly in the same form as the Greek, in the masculine and neuter like, nominative masculine lik (according to §. 257.), neuter liko; hence tolik, toliko, "talis," "tale," or "tantus," "tantum," —Greek τηλίκος, τηλίκον, and Prákrit, tārisā, tārisān,

* Regarding leiks, see, too, p. 1442. G. ed.
† See the Old High German compounds of this kind in Graff II. 105.
Sanskrit तद्रिस, तद्रिस्म: kolik, koliko, "qualis," "quale," "quantus," "quantum?" = Greek τηλίκος, τηλίκον, Prākrit kērisō, kērisāṁ, Sanskrit kūḍraśas, kūḍraśam: yelik, yeliko, relative = Greek ἡλίκος, ἡλίκον, Prākrit yārisō, yārisāṁ, Sanskrit yadṛisās, yadṛisam. With respect to the relative expression, it is important to remark, that, in this derivative, the base ye (euphonic for yo,) which commonly signifies "he" (§. 282.), has preserved the original relative signification without the elsewhere necessary enclitic she. Dobrowsky, however (p. 344), in assuming ik alone in this derivative as suffix "interposito tamen l," appears not to have noticed the surprising similarity of the Greek forms in λίκος, otherwise he would have assigned to the l a more important share in the work of derivation. But the Slavonic forms differ from those of the cognate languages in this, that they do not lengthen the final vowel of the primitive pronoun, or replace o by a: for, according to §. 255. a., the Slavonic o corresponds to the Sanskrit short a, and a to the long ā. We should therefore look for talik as answering to the Sanskrit tādriśa-s, and Prākrit tārisō. It cannot, however, be matter of surprise, that, in the course of thousands of years, which separate the Slavonic from identity with its cognate idioms, a weakening of the vowel should have taken place in the preceding case; as shortenings, weakenings, and abrasions of sounds, are the most common alterations which time introduces into the original form of a language. There are, however, in Slavonic, other formations of cognate meaning, in which the base syllable has retained the old weight of the vowels, while the suffix has been abbreviated by dropping the syllable li, and appears in combination with the affix of the definite declension: hence takyi, "talis," kakyī, "qualis?" yakyī, "qualis" (relative).* The simple neuters,

* Dobrowsky (p. 343) incorrectly regards ak as derivative, since in respect
that is, those divested of the definite prefix *tako, kako,* occur as adverbs, the former with the signification "so," the latter with that of "how?" By the rejection of the syllable *ši,* *takyi* and its correlatives, in respect to their last element, become identical with the interrogative *kyi,* "quis?" which is likewise declined definitely; and therefore we cannot entirely set aside the objection, that *takyi* is a compound of the demonstrative with the interrogative. The explanation, however, given above is to be preferred, because by it the *a* of the first member of the compound, as also the signification of the whole, is shewn to have a very ancient foundation; while by the second mode we should not be able to see why *tokyï, ękkyï, kokyï,* should not be used, or *tkyï,* *ıkkyï;* and why the mere appending of the interrogative to the pronoun preceding should have the same effect as the suffix under discussion has in the cognate languages.

419. But if the Old Slavonic correlatives *takyï, kakyï, ąskyï,* are abbreviations of *tališkyï,* &c., then the analogous and æqui-significant Lithuanian forms *toks,* "talš," *koks,* "qualis" (theme *tokia, kokia,* see §. 411.), must also be viewed in this light, and the agreement of the former with the

[G. Ed. p. 605.] *torkins* (Grimm. III. 49.), which exists in Old Swedish, together with *tolik* and *tolkin,* would consequently not be fortuitous. The Latin suffix *li* in *talis,* *qualis,* *æqualis,†* exhibits a contrary abbreviation, since it has retained the initial part of the original adjective of

respect to the primitive pronoun he proceeds from the abbreviated nominative masculine *t', k'; i,* and, in general, is in the dark regarding the theme of the base words, and the historical relation of the *o* to *a,* developed in §. 255. a., through the Sanskrit, as also its length.

* According to the analogy of *kto, chto,* §. 400.

† *Æqualis* is, probably, with regard to its last element, so far identical with *qualis,* as *æquus* is most probably connected with the Sanskrit एक अं "unus," and the latter is, in its final syllable, identical with the interrogative base *ka* (§. 308.).
similarity, as also the long vowel of the pronominal base, but has lost the last syllable, or the guttural only, of ताद्रिक, कीद्रिक (§. 415., p. 597 G. ed.), ηλικ-ς, όμηλικ-ς. The identity of the formation lies beyond all doubt, and Voss has already shewn that तāλिस is identical with ταλίκος. To the constant occurrence of a long ā in these ancient forms may be ascribed the fact, that, in more modern formations of this sort, particularly belonging to the Latin, an ā is inserted before the suffix, or added to the primitive base, in case it terminates with a consonant; hence, regālis,* legālis, conjugaīlis, hiemālis, carnālis, augurālis, &c. On the other hand, in bases with a short final vowel this is merely lengthened, and the u (o) of the second declension is changed into a long i instead of the short i, which is elsewhere introduced before suffixes; hence, civā-lis, hosti-lis, juvenē-lis, from civi, hosti, juveni;† and so, also, virē-lis from viru, puerē-lis from puercu, servē-lis from servu, &c.: anē-lis, also, from the organic u of the fourth declension, which is no less subject to be weakened to i, as is proved by the dative-ablatives in i-bus. Here, perhaps, may be classed, also, though with a short i, words in ti-lis [G. Ed. p. 606.] or si-lis, which spring either from lost abstracts in ti-s, si-s,‡ or passive participles, the u of which must be weakened before the new suffix to i; thus, ficti-lis, missi-lis, either from the obsolete abstracts ficti-s, missi-s—whence the secondary forms fictio, missio—or from factus (weakened from factus, §. 6.), missus. So, also, simi-lis, with short i, from the lost primitive simu-s = Sanskrit sama-s, "similar," Gothic sama (theme saman), and Greek ὁμο-ς; and humi-lis,

* As to forms like regālī-s see also §. 942. conclusion.
† From the primitive base juven=Sanskrit yuvan, comes juvenālis; gentilis comes from a base genti (compare Lithuanian gentis, "kinsman"), the i of which, and consequently the t also, are suppressed in the nominative gens.
THE VERB.

[G. Ed. p. 617.] 426. The Sanskrit has two forms for the active, of which the one is appointed for the transitive and outwardly-operating direction, and is called by the Indian grammarians parasmāi-padam, equivalent to "stranger-form"; the other, which is called ātmanēpadam, i.e. "self-form," serves, when it stands in its primitive signification, for reflexive or intransitive purposes, or shews that the action is to the advantage of the subject or stands in some near relation thereto. For instance, dā, "to give," in the ātmanēpadam, in conjunction with the preposition d, has the force of "to take," i.e. "to give oneself": the causative darsayāmi, "to make to see," "to shew," acquires, through the terminations of the ātmanēpadam, the signification "to shew oneself"; śō, "to lie" (śōtē=keīrai), ās, "to sit" (āstē=ṣārai, p. 118), mud, "to be pleased," "to please oneself," ruch, "to shine," "to please," "to please oneself," are only used in the ātmanēpadam; yāch, "to require," "to ask," has both forms, but the reflexive prevails, as we most generally require or pray for our own advantage. In general, however, the language, as it at present exists, disposes of both forms, in rather an arbitrary manner. But few verbs have retained the two; and where this happens, the primitive intention of both seldom shews itself distinctly. Of the cognate languages, only the Zend, the Greek, and the Gothic have retained this primitive reflexive form; for that the Gothic passive is
identical in construction with the Indo-Greek middle has
been already shown in my Conjugation-system.* Grimm has
since directed attention to two expressions which have re-
mained unnoticed in former Grammars, and which are of the
greatest importance, as having preserved the old middle
form in a middle signification also. Ulfilas, namely, twice
(Matt. xxvii. 42. and Mark xv. 32.) translates καταβατω by
“atsteigadau,” and once (Matt. xxvii. 43.) ρυσάσθω by “laus-
yadau.” Lately, also, v. Gabelentz and Löbe, in their valu-
able edition of Ulfilas (pp. 187 and 225), have justly assigned
to the middle the following forms, all but one lately brought
to light, by Castiglione’s edition of St. Paul’s Epistles :
υσκυννάδα, γνώσονται (John xiii. 35.); faianda, “vituperunt”
(Rom. ix. 19.); γανασύδα ὑνιδανειν, ἐνδύσηται ἀφθαρίαν
(1 Cor. xv. 54.); ναυρκυδα, ἑργάζεται (2 Cor. iv. 17.); υστιυ-
χάδα, κατεργάζεται (2 Cor. vii. 10.); and liugandau, γαμησά-
tωσαν (1 Cor. vii. 9.). Grimm, in the first edition of his
Grammar (p. 444), gives the forms atsteigadau and lausyadau,
justly, I doubt not, as imperatives, but considers them as
erroneous transferences of the Greek expressions into the
passive form. What, however, could induce Ulfilas to trans-
late the middle ρυσάσθω, not to mention the active καταβάτω,
by a passive, when he had so many other opportunities for
exchanging Greek middles for passives? In the second
the III. subjunctive of a Gothic middle?” Were they, how-
ever, subjunctives middle, they must then have retained the
characteristic i of this mood, and, in this respect, have an-
swered to the Indo-Greek middle, such as bharēτα (from
bharaīta), φέπορο. The middle and passive could not be dis-
tinguished by the insertion or suppression of the exponent
of the subjunctive relation. I explain, therefore, atsteigadau
and lausyadau, as well as the later liugandau (γαμησάτωσαν),

* P. 122. Compare Vocalismus, p. 79, and Grimm 1. 1050.
without hesitation, as imperatives of the middle voice; for as such they answer excellently well to the Sanskrit middle imperatives, as bhar-a-țăm, “let him bear or receive,” bhar-a-ntām, “let them bear or receive.” The Gothic au has the same relation here to the Sanskrit ām, as, in the first subjunctive person active, where, for instance, siyau, “ich sei,” “I may be,” answers to the Sanskrit sydm. The old m has been resolved into u, and has formed a diphthong with the preceding a (compare § 255. g.). In respect to form, however, atsteigadau, lausyadau, and liugandau, are at the same time passive; and Ulfilas would probably have also rendered the idea “let him be freed” by lausyadau. In the translation of the Bible, however, an occasion for the use of the passive imperative rarely occurs.

427. While the Greek and Gothic have carried over the middle form into the passive, so that the passive and middle, with the exception of the Greek aorist and future, are perfectly identical; in the Sanskrit and Zend the passive, indeed, exhibits the more important terminations of the middle, through which the symbolical retro-operation of the action on the subject is expressed, but a practical distinction occurs in the special tenses (§. 109*), in that the syllable ya—of which more hereafter—is appended to the root, but the characteristic additions and other peculiarities, [G. Ed. p. 620.] by which the different classes are distinguished in the two active forms, are resumed. In Greek, deik-uu-ταύ is as well passive as middle, but in Sanskrit, चिन्दे चि-नु-ते, from चि चि, “gather,” is only middle, and the passive is चि-ya-ते: in Greek, διδοταί, ἵταταί, are both passive and middle; in Sanskrit the kindred forms दत-ते, anomalous for दद-ते, तिथ्तेज्ञ-तेते, are only middle, and their passive becomes दे-yatè, sthē-yatē.* In that the Sanskrit and Zend passive is formed immediately from the root,

*Some of the roots in ṣ weaken that vowel to i before the passive characteristic ya.
The class-characteristics being removed, it answers to other derivative verbs, the causal, desiderative, and intensive, and we, in treating of them, shall return to it. The middle, however, we shall treat pari passu with the transitive active form, as it is distinguished from this latter, in nearly every case, only by the extension of the personal terminations.

428. The moods in Sanskrit are five, if we include the indicative, in which, in fact, no modal relations, but only those of time, are expressed. The absence of modal accessory notions is its characteristic. The other moods are, the potential, imperative, precative,* and conditional. Besides these, we find in the Vêdas fragments of a mood, which, in the principle of its formation, corresponds to the Greek subjunctive, and by the grammarians is called lê†. The same moods, even to the subjunctive, or lê, exist in Zend, only I am not able to cite the conditional, which stands in nearest connection with the future, and [G. Ed. p. 621.] which in Sanskrit, also, is very rare. The infinitive and participle belong to the noun. The indicative has six tenses, viz. one present, three preterites, and two futures. The preterites, in form, correspond to the Greek imperfect, aorist, and perfect. With their use, however, the language, in its present condition, deals very capriciously; for which reason, in my Sanskrit Grammar, I have named them only with reference to their form: the first, single-formed augmented preterite; the second, multiform augmented preterite; and the third, reduplicated preterite. Both futures are likewise indistinguishable in their use, and I name them according to their composition: the one, which answers to the Greek

* Benedictive, according to us.
† The Indian grammarians name the tenses and moods after vowels, which, to designate the principal tenses, are inserted between ः l and ः t, and, to designate the secondary, between ः l and ः n. Thus the names run, lât, lût, lût, lrit, lêt, lôt; lan, lin, lûn, lrin. See Colebrooke's Grammar, pp. 132. 181.
and Lithuanian future, and is most used, the auxiliary future; the other, the participial future, as its first element is a participle which answers to the Latin in *turus*. In the Zend I have not yet detected this tense, but all the other Sanskrit tenses I have, and have given proofs of this in the reviews mentioned in the preface (p. xii. last line but two.). The moods ranging after the indicative have, in Sanskrit and Zend, only one tense each; yet the potential and preceptive have, in fact, such a relation to each other, as, in Greek, the present and second aorist of the optative; and Pāṇini embraces both of these modal forms under the name *elin*. The same relation of wishing and praying, which is specially represented by the preceptive, may also be expressed by the potential, which is in far more general use. In the Vēdas traces are apparent of a further elaboration of the moods into various tenses, and it may hence be inferred, that what the European languages, in their development of the moods, have in excess over the Sanskrit and Zend, dates, at

[G. Ed. p. 622.] least in its origin, from the period of the unity of the language.

429. The numbers of the verb are three in most of the languages here treated of. The Latin verb has, like its noun, lost the dual; but the Germanic has preserved the verbal dual in its oldest dialect, the Gothic, in preference to that of the noun; the Old Sclavonic retains it in both; and so has the Lithuanian to the present day. The Pāli and Prākrit, otherwise so near to the Sanskrit, have, like the Latin, parted with both the dual and the middle of the active forms. In opposition to the Semitic, there is no distinction of gender in the personal signs of the Sanskrit family; which is not surprising, as the two first persons, even in their simple condition, are without the distinction, while the Semitic dispenses with it only in the first person, as well simple as in the verb, but, in the second and third, in both conditions distinguishes the
feminine from the masculine. The Old Sclavonic has, in the dual, gained a feminine in an inorganic fashion, and by a divergence from the primary type of its class, as well in its simple pronoun of the first person, as in the three persons of the verb. As, namely, \( va \), “we two,” has the termination of a masculine substantive dual, to which the feminine in \( ye \) corresponds (§. 273.); so, by the power of analogy, out of that \( va \) has been developed a feminine \( vye \), and, in accordance with this, in the verb also; for instance, \( kva \) \( yesva \), “we two are” (masculine), \( kva \) \( yesvye \) (feminine), answering to the Sanskrit \( swas \) (abbreviated from \( aswas \)), and the Lithuanian \( esva \). In the same manner, in the second and third dual persons, which, in the masculine, are both \( yesta \), answering to the Sanskrit \( (a)sthas \), \( (a)stas \), and the Greek \( \\text{ēstov} \), \( \text{ēstov} \), a feminine \( yestye \) \( kuv \) has been formed; for as, in virtue of the law by which the terminating sibilant of the Sanskrit form is necessarily rejected [G. Ed. p. 623.] (see §. 255. l.), the verbal dual ending became identical with that of the masculine noun, and as, moreover, the termination \( ta \) has precisely the same sound with the independent \( ta \), “these two” (men), the way was thus opened to the formation of a feminine personal termination \( tye \), which is also identical with the independent \( tye \), “these two” (women). These feminine verbal terminations are in any case worthy of observation, as they rest on the feeling of the grammatical identity of the verb with the noun, and shew that the spirit of the language was vitally imbued with the principle of close connection, which had of old existed between the simple pronouns and those joined with the verbal bases.

430. With respect to the personal signs, the tenses and moods fall most evidently, in Sanskrit, Zend, and Greek, into two classes. The one is fuller, the other more contracted in its terminations. To the first class belong those tenses which, in Greek, we are accustomed to call the principal, namely, the present, future, and perfect or reduplicated
preterite, whose terminations, however, have undergone serious mutilations in the three sister languages, which clearly have their foundation in the incumbrance of the commencement by the reduplication-syllable. To the second class belong the augmented preterites, and, in Sanskrit and Zend, all the moods not indicative, with the exception of the present of the \( \textit{l\text{et}} \) or subjunctive, and of those terminations of the imperative which are peculiar to this mood, and are rather full than contracted. In Greek, the subjunctive has the fuller terminations, but the optative, which answers to the Sanskrit potential, has, like its Asiatic prototype, the contracted. The termination \( \mu \) of \( \textit{τ\upsilonπτο\iota\mu} \) is, as we have elsewhere observed,* inorganic, as appears from a comparison with the \( \textit{τ\upsilonπτο\iota\mu\eta\nu} \) which has sprung from the original form \( \textit{τ\upsilonπτο\iota\nu} \) and the conjugation in \( \mu \) (\( \delta\delta\delta\eta\ieta\nu \)).

431. In Latin, this double form of the personal terminations, although in an inverted relation, makes itself observable in this, that where the fuller form \( \textit{mi} \) stood, the termination, excepting in the cases of \( \textit{sum} \) and \( \textit{inquam} \), has vanished altogether. On the other hand, the original final \( m \) has everywhere maintained itself. Hence, \( \textit{amo, amabo} \); but \( \textit{amaham, eram, sim, amem} \), as, in Sanskrit, \( \textit{a-bhavam} \) and \( \textit{dsam} \), “I was,” \( \textit{sy\dot{a}m} \), “I may be,” \( \textit{kimay\dot{e}yam} \), “I may love.” In the other persons an uniformity of terminations has crept in by the abrasion of the \( i \) of the primary forms; thus, \( \textit{legis(i), legit(i), legunt(i)} \), as \( \textit{legas, legat, legant} \).

432. In the Gothic, the aboriginal separation into the full and mutilated terminations makes itself principally conspicuous in that the terminations \( ti \) and \( nti \) of the primary forms have retained the \( T \) sound, because it was protected by a following vowel, but have lost the \( i \): on the other hand, the concluding \( t \) of the secondary forms,

* Berlin Jahrb. Feb. 1827, p. 279, or Vocalismus, p. 44.
as in the Greek, has vanished: hence, for example: 
bair-i-th, bair-a-nd, answering to भरति bhar-a-ti, भरति bhar-
a-nti (फेप-o-व्रि), but bair-ai, like फेपou, answering to भरत् bhar-é-t (from भराति) fer-a-t. In the first person singular, 
the full termination mi (with the exception of im, "I am") 
has, in remarkable accordance with the Latin, quite dis-
appeared: on the other hand, the concluding m of the sec-
dondary forms has not, indeed, as in the Latin, been retained 
unaltered, but yet has kept its place in the resolved form of u 
(compare §.426. p.619. G. ed.): thus bair-a, answering to 
भरति bhar-ā-mi, but bair-a-u (from bairam [G. Ed. p.625.] 
for bairaim),* answering to भरयम् bhar-ey-am, fer-a-m. In 
the second person singular, as in the Latin, an identity be-
tween the primary and secondary forms has introduced 
itself, since the first have lost the concluding i, and the latter 
have not brought one from the Asiatic seat of their class; 
hence bair-i-s, answering to भरति bhar-a-si, and also bair-
ai-s to भरस् bhar-ē-s, fer-ā-s, फेप-ο-ς. 

433. In the Old Slavonic, the secondary forms have, 
in the singular, been compelled entirely to abandon the 
personal consonant (see §.255. l.), on account of its being 
final; hence, in the imperative, which is identical with 
the Sanskrit potential, the Greek optative, and Roman-
German subjunctive, the second person singular ends with 
the modal-vowel i, and, in the preterite, answering to the 
Sanskrit-Greek aorist, the second and third persons have 
the same sound, because the concluding s, like t, was ne-
necessarily dropped. Compare, in the preterite iterative, the 
termination we, she, we, she, with the Sanskrit सी sīs, सीत sīt. 
On the other hand, the primary forms give the expression 
of the second person singular with wonderful accuracy, as 
मू, shi, or तु, si; and out of the ति ti of the third we have 
र, and, in the plural एत from anti. We now proceed to a 
closer consideration of the personal signs.

* Compare Vocalismus, p 203.
FIRST PERSON.

434. The character of the first person is, in the singular as well as plural, in its original shape, \( m \); but in the dual the languages, which possess a first dual person in the transitive [G. Ed. p. 626.] active form, have softened the \( m \) to \( v \), as we have also found \( वोध्य m \) \( \text{vayam} \) "we," for \( मयम् mayam \) in the plural of the simple pronoun, and similar phenomena in several cognate languages (§.331.). The full characteristic of the first person singular is, in the primary form of the transitive active, \( \text{mi} \), and spreads itself, in Sanskrit and Zend, over all verbs without exception: in Greek, however—peculiarities of dialect excepted—it extends only over such as answer to the second chief Sanskrit conjugation, which embraces the classes two, three, five, seven, eight, and nine (§. 109*), but altogether comprises but a small proportion of the verbs (about 200). The other Greek verbs have quite suppressed the personal termination, and their \( \omega \) (omega), like the Latin \( o \) of all conjugations, answers to the Sanskrit \( ड \), which, in forms like \( बोध्य-\text{a-}mi \), "I know," \( \text{tud-}a-mi \), "I wound," "I slay," belongs neither to the root nor the personal termination, but is the character of the class, which, when it consists of a short \( a \), or of syllables ended by \( a \), lengthens that letter before \( m \) and \( v \) followed by a vowel: hence, \( बोध्य-\text{a-}mi \), \( बोध्य-\text{a-}vas \), \( \text{bodh-}a-mas \), in contrast to \( \text{bodh-}a-si \), \( \text{bodh-}a-ti \); \( \text{bodh-}a-thas \), \( \text{bodh-}a-tas \); \( \text{bodh-}a-tha \), \( \text{bodh-}a-nti \). The Greek has no participation in this lengthening, and makes \( \text{τροπ-}o-\mu ν \) answer to the Sanskrit \( \text{tarp-}a-mas \). It is possible, however, that, in the singular, \( \text{τροπ-}ω-\mu \) may have once stood, answering to \( \text{tarp-}a-mi \); and if so, we might conjecture that this \( \omega \) may have been shortened in the plural and dual (middle) by the influence of the increased weight of the terminations, of which more hereafter; thus, also, in the medio-passive. The to-be-presupposed \( \text{τροπ-}ω-\mu \) has, in fact, the same relation to \( \text{τροπ-}o-\mu ν \), and \( \text{τροπ-}o-\mu αι \), that \( \text{διω-}μ \) has to \( \text{διο-}μ ν \) and \( \text{δι-}o-\mu αι \). If, however, we prefer, which I should not, to
assume τέρπ-ο-μι as the primitive form, the length of τέρπω must then be considered as a compensation for the loss of the termination. In any case the middle-pas-

sive μαι, which spreads itself over all classes of verbs, proves that they all have had a μι in the active; for μαι has sprung form μι, as σαι, ται, νται, from σι, τι, ντι; and without the presence either of a τέρπωμι or a τέρπομι we could have no τέρπομαι. With regard to the all-prevalent conservation of the character of the first person in the middle-passives, the Greek maintains a conspicuous advantage over its Asiatic cognates, which, in the singular of the middle, as well in the primary as in the secondary forms, have suffered the μ to vanish without leaving a trace. If τέρπω be, as it were, amended from the Sanskrit form tarp-ā-mi, the mutilated Sanskrit form tarpē* may be, in like manner, traced back from the Greek τέρπ-ο-μαι to its original form tarp-ā-mē, or tarp-a-mē.

435. We find, in what has been said above, a very remarkable confirmation of the maxim, that the various members of the great family of language now under discus-

sion must of necessity mutually illustrate and explain each other, since not even the most perfect among them have been handed down to us uncorrupted in every part of their rich organism. For while the ending μαι is still extant in all its splendor in the Modern-Greek passive, the correspon-
ding Sanskrit form lay in ruins at that period when the oldest existing sample of Indian literature, the Vēdas, were composed, the antiquated language of which has con-
veyed to us so many other remnants of the primæval type of the family. On the other hand, Homer, in all the overwhelming variety of his present and future forms, was com-
pelled to forego the terminating μι, which was the mother of his μαι, which is the only existing termination in the Sanskrit,

* Such would be the form of tarpāmi in the middle voice, in which, however, it is not used.
and which to this day the Lithuanian utters in the following verbs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lithuanian</th>
<th>Sanskrit</th>
<th>Greek</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'riemi, “I am,”</td>
<td>əsmi,</td>
<td>ēμι, ειμι.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eimi, “I go,”</td>
<td>ēmi,</td>
<td>ειμι.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>důmi, “I give,”</td>
<td>dudâmi,</td>
<td>δίδωμι.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stōwmi, “I stand,”</td>
<td>tīsthāmī,</td>
<td>ἵστημι.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>edmi, “I eat,”</td>
<td>=admi</td>
<td>....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sēdmi, “I sit,”</td>
<td>=ni-šādamī, “I sit down”</td>
<td>....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>giēdmi, “I sing,”</td>
<td>gadōmi, “I say”</td>
<td>....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sērgmi, “I guard”</td>
<td>....</td>
<td>....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sāugtmi, “I preserve”</td>
<td>....</td>
<td>....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>miēgmi, “I sleep”</td>
<td>....</td>
<td>....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>liekmi, “I leave,”</td>
<td>=raḥāmi, “I forsake?”</td>
<td>....</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

436. We must take into account that in all these verbs the termination μ, as in the Sanskrit second class (§ 109a. 3) and in the verbs which correspond to it, such as φημι, ειμι, is combined directly with the root. The Old Sclovonic also has preserved, in some verbs of this kind, which we would name the Archaic conjugation, the termination mi, not, indeed, in its original purity, but under the shape of my. Before this my, however, as also in the first person plural before my, and before the sibilant of the second person singular, a radical d is suppressed, which d, before termi-

* Kalpayāmi, on which the Gothic root halp, “to help” (present hilpa, preterite halp), is probably based, is, in all likelihood, akin to the root kar (κρι), “to make.”

† Compare p.441.

† Fad alone forms an exception, in that, in the second and third person dual
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чимь yesmy, "I am,"
вемь vyemy, "I know,"
ведать vyedyaty, "they know,"
дамь damy, "I give,"
дадать dudaty, "they give,"
ямь yamy, "I eat,"
гадать yadaty, "they eat,"

SANSKRIT.

चर्मि asmi.
चेर्मि vêdmi.
चिद्रन्ति vidanti.
द्रशमि daddmi.
द्रशमि adanti.

Thus also the compound чёмь sn-ymy for sn-yamy, "comedo," "manduco,"† and имамь imamy, "I have." The Krainish deserves special attention in respect of the first person singular, as, without exception, it has preserved the personal м, although with entire renunciation of the i; for instance, délum, "I labor": so, in Polish, in the first conjugation, as Bandtke has it, czytam, "I read." In Old Sclavonic, however, we find everywhere in the common conjugation & u, and we have already remarked that we recognise, in the latter part of this diphthong, the melting of this personal sign м into a short u sound, which, with the preceding conjugation-vowel, has resolved itself into u, as in Greek τύπτωσαι from τύπτοντι (§. 255. y.). [G. Ed. p. 690.]

In the same light is to be regarded the Lithuanian a in Mielckes first and second conjugation; compare sukà, "I turn," and penà, "I feed," with the plural suk-a-më, pen-a-më. On the other hand, in verbs like laikau, "I hold," yeszkau, "I seek," myliu, "I love," the u only belongs to the personal sign. It is otherwise with the Old High German u in Grimm's strong and first weak conjugation: in these, u is a weakening of the Gothic a (Vocalismus, p. 227, ff.), and this

---

* Is generally used with a future signification.
† The Sanskrit preposition sam, Greek σω, has, in Sclavonic, usually lost the nasal, but has preserved it in the above instances.
is itself a shortening of the Sanskrit त, and so far corresponds to the Greek ο and Latin o (see §. 434.). Compare the Gothic bair-a-, Old High German bir-u- (piru), with भरे bhar-ā-mi, फेरे-ω- (µ), fer-o. The only verb which, in Gothic has preserved a remnant of the termination µ, is im, “I am,” = अस्मि amsi, &c. In High German, however, the remains of this old termination are more numerous: in the German bin it has to this day rescued itself from total suppression. The Old High German form is bin, or pim, a contraction of the Sanskrit bhavāmi, the v of which reappears in the shape of r in the plural birumēs. Besides these, the personal sign in Old High German fastens on some other isolated verbs, as on gam, “I go,” = तागमि jagāmi, βίβημι, (p. 111); stām, “I stand,” = तिखοधमि tikhāmi, Zend तिखोधम histāmi, Greek, ἵστημι (p. 111); tuom, “I do,” = Sanskrit दधमि dadhami, “I place,” Greek τιθημὶ, विदाधमि vi-dadhami, “I make”; and, further, on those classes of verbs which exhibit the Sanskrit form aya in the shape of e or o (Grimm’s second and third conjugations of the weak form, see §. 109a. 6.).

Hence habām (Gothic haba), damnōm, and phlanzōm, are more perfect than the corresponding Latin forms habeo, damnō, planto. Yet it is only the oldest monuments which exhibit the m termination: the more modern substitute n.

[G. Ed. p. 631.] 437. In the secondary forms the expression of the first person singular, in Sanskrit and Zend, is terminated by m without a vowel; and this mutilated ending, which has maintained itself in Latin in preference to the fuller mi (§. 431.), has been forced in Greek, by a universal law of sound, to become ν; just as we have seen, in the Old High German, the final m of the most ancient authorities corrupted into n. Compare ἔτερπ-ο-ν with aturp-a-m, ἐδιδω-ν and ἐδω-ν with adadā-m and adā-m; and further, ἐδο-ιν and δο-ιν with dad-ya m and δέ-yam. In the first Greek aorist the personal sign has vanished; hence, ἕδειξα contrasted with άδικθα adiktham. The older ἕδειξα from
a still older form ἔρειξαμ, can be traced, however, out of the resulting middle form ἔρειξάμ-νυ. With respect to the Gothic u for m, we refer the reader to §. 432.

“Remark.—We have, above, divided atarp-a-m after the fashion of the Greek ἔτερπ-ο-ν, but have further to observe, that, according to the Indian grammarians, the full termination of the first person singular of the secondary form is not a simple m, but am: accordingly, atarpam would stand for atarpám from atarp-a-am, and we should have to assume an elision of the intermediate syllable a. In fact, we find the termination am in places where the a cannot, as in atarp-a-m, anab-ya-m, adarś-aya-m, be assigned to the class character (§. 109*. 1. 2. 6.); for we form, for instance, out of i, “go,” āy-am, not di-m, “I went”; from brā, “speak,” abrāv-am or abrūv-am, not abrō-m, “I spoke”; and from the syllables nu and u, which, in the special tenses, are appended to the roots of the fifth and eighth class (§. 109*. 4.), spring, not nō-m, ṃ-m, as we might expect from the present nō-mi, ṃ-mi, but navam, avam; and thus, for instance, we find अस्त्रिनावम astrinavam, plural अस्त्रिनावम astrinuma, answering to ἐστόρνυ, ἐστορνυμεν. As, however, the second person in Sanskrit has a simple s, the third a simple t, for its sign, and, for instance, as̄tri-nō-s, as̄tri-nō-t, answer to the Gr. ἐστόρ-νυ-ς, ἐστόρ-νυ(γ); from thence, as well as from the fact that the Greek also, in the first person, has a simple ν, we may deduce that the a of astrinavam is inorganic, and imported from the first conjugation, just as, in Greek, we find for ἐστόρνυ-ν [G. Ed. p. 632.] also ἐστόρνυ-ο-ν; and so, in the third person, together with ἐστόρνυ also ἐστόρνυ-ε, to which a Sanskrit as̄tri nav-a-t would correspond. The verbs which unite the personal terminations immediately with roots ending in consonants may have particularly favoured the introduction of an a into the first person; thus, for instance, to the present vēdmi, “I know,” no avēdm could follow; the personal character must have vanished entirely—as in the second and third person, where,
instead of avēt-s, avēt-t, by §. 94. avēt (for avēd) is used*—or else the aid of an intermediate vowel must have been sought, as the nominal bases terminating in a consonant add am instead of simple m in the accusative, from whence this termination has passed also over to monosyllabic bases terminating with a vowel; so that nāv-am for nāum, and bhruv-am for bhru m have the same relation to the Greek ναῦ-ν, ὀφρύ-ν, that we have seen astriṇav-am (for astriṇām) bear to ἐστῷπνῦ-ν. In any case, however, the a has acquired a firm establishment in the first person singular of the secondary forms; and it would be best perhaps, practically as well as theoretically, to lay down the rule, that where a or d does not precede the terminating m as the property either of a class, a mood, or a root, that letter is introduced: hence we find artarp-a-m, “plucabam,” adaidda-m, “dabam,” ayd-m, “ibam” (from the root yd), ayu-nā-m, “ligabam,” (cl. 9. see §. 109*. 5.), dadyd-m, “dem”; but also astriṇav-am, “sternebam,” for astriṇām; and tarpa-ny-am, “placem” (§. 43.), for tarpebm; tišthē-y-am, “stem,” for tišthēm, which last would accord more closely with tišthēs, “stes”; tišthēt, “stet”; tišthēma, “stēmus”; tišthēta, “stētis.”

438. In the Gothic, as we have before remarked (§. 432.), the m of the secondary forms has resolved itself into u. This termination, however, has entirely vanished from the Old High German, with the exception of a solitary example, which has preserved the original m in preference to the Gothic u; namely, lirmem, “discam,” in Kero. In the Lithuanian, both the mutilated m and the fuller ending mi have been corrupted into u, and therefore just as laikau, “I hold,” is related to the to-be-presupposed laikam from laikami, [G. Ed. p. 633.] so is buwau to the Sanskrit a-hhavam, “I was.” With respect to the Slavonic, I may refer the

* In the second person the form avē-s also holds good with the radical consonant suppressed and the termination retained, as in the Latin nomi-
natives, like pe-s for ped-s.
reader to what has been said generally (§. 433.) on the singular secondary terminations, and to what will follow here-after on the preterite in particular.

439. With regard to the origin of the termination of the first person, I consider mi to be a weakened form of the syllable ma (compare p. 102), which, in Sanskrit and Zend, lies at the foundation of the oblique cases of the simple pronoun as theme. In the word dadāmi, mi has the same relation to the ma in which it originates, as the Latin i bears in compounds like tubiCIN(-cinis), to the true radical form CAN. The secondary form rests on a further weakening of mi to m, which, though it be of most remote antiquity, as would appear from its striking accordance with the sister languages of Europe, still does not belong to those times when the organization of the language was yet flourishing in all its parts, and in full vigour. I do not, at least, believe, that in the youth of our family of languages there was already a double series of personal terminations; but I entertain the conjecture, that, in the course of time, the terminations underwent a polishing process in those places where an accession to the anterior part (in the augment-preterites), or an insertion into the interior (in the potential or optative), had given greater occasion for such a process.* The gradual prevalence of the mutilated terminations is illustrated by the fact, that, in Latin, all the plurals still end in mus, in Greek in μεν (μες), while in Sanskrit the corresponding form मस mas only remains in the primary forms, and even in these shews itself not unfrequently in the mutilated form ma. [G. Ed. p. 634.] which, in the secondary terminations, has become the rule: hence we have, indeed, tarp-ā-mas, sarp-ā-mas, and occasionally tarp-ā-ma, sarp-ā-ma, corresponding to τέρπ-ο-μές, serp-i-mus, (§. 109* 1.); but constantly atarp-ā-ma, asarp-ā-ma, answering to ἑτέρπ-ο-μές, serpebamus; constantly ἄς-ma,

* Compare Vocalismus, Rem. 16.
answering to ἡ(σ)−μες, erάmus, dadyd−ma to ὑδοιν−μες, and tîshthē−ma to stêmus. To pass, however, to the explanation of the termination mas, we might assume that it should be divided into m−as; that the m should stand as theme, but the as as a plural nominative termination; for mas ends like पदस padas, μες like πόδες, and the personal endings always express a nominative relation. It is, however, also possible that the s of mas rests on the same principle as the s of the Zend əνιρ əνιρ yûs, "you," for yûsmē, and the s of the Sanskrit nas, vas, and Latin nos, vos.* Then असम ad−mas would signify "I and they eat," as we have seen that समे a−smē was considered a copulative compound in the sense of "I and they" (§.333.).† In this view the Vēdic termination māsi, on which rests the Zend mahi—for instance, डदमसि dadmasi, डादेमहि dadēmahi, "we give"—would [G. Ed. p. 635.] appear to be a mutilation and weakening of the appended pronoun sma, or the i of māsi would be a mutilation of ἢ ( =a+i); and māsi (for māsmē) would thus join itself to the Vēdic plural nominative asmē for masmē. The independent asmē would have lost the first, and the termination māsi the second m. If, however, the first supposition be the true one, the i of māsi might be compared with the Greek demonstrative ἦ, omitting the difference of quantity.

* See §§.335.336.337
† As in the expression "we" other companions are more usually attributed to the I than the person or persons addressed, to whom, in fact, things are usually recounted in which they themselves have had no share; and as, moreover, for the idea "we two," in its simple use, a special form is provided, which perhaps existed before other duals; it seems to me little likely that Pott's conjecture (Berl. Jahrb. March 1833, p.336) is correct, that the syllable mas of the first person plural properly expresses "I and thou"; and that therefore the pronoun of the second person is expressed by the s, in the same form in which it appears in the singular of the verb, which in any case we are obliged first to derive from the t of twam, while, by the explanation above, the s is given as existing originally.
440. The Old High German exhibits the first person plural in the very full and perfect shape mēs, as well in the primary as in the secondary forms—i.e. in the indicative and subjunctive—while the Gothic has in the one merely m, in the other ma. In the Lithuanian we find everywhere mē; in the Carniolan mo, for instance, délamo, "we labor"; but the Old Sclavonic has a naked m or my—the latter, however, only in a few verbs, which have, in the singular, the more full termination my (p. 609); for instance, мами ya-my, "we eat," = चर्मस ad-mas; вами vye-my, "we know," = जिसस vid-mas. This Sclavonic my for e or o, which, according to §. 255. a., we might expect in answer to the Sanskrit च a, is, I believe, produced by the euphonic influence of the original s which concludes the form (compare §. 271.). It is more difficult to account for the long e in Old High German, unless Graff (I. 21.) be right in his conjecture, that the termination mēs may rest upon that peculiar to the Vēdas, masi. We should then have to assume either that the i which had been dropped from the termination had been replaced by the lengthening of the antecedent vowel (thus mēs for mās, as in Gothic ē = चा ē, §. 69.), or that the i had fallen back into the preceding syllable; for out of ai we have, in Old High German, as in Sanskrit, ē. In Gothic, we may be surprised that the more mutilated termination m should answer to the fuller Sanskrit termination मस mas, while the shorter ma [G. Ed. p. 636.] of the secondary forms has remained unaltered; thus bair-a-m, "ferimus," contrasted with बरमस bhar-ā-mas and bair-ai-ma, "feramus," answering to बर बhar-ē-ma. Probably the diphthong ai, and, in the preterite subjunctive, the long ē (written ei, as in bēr-ei-ma), was found better able to bear the weight of the personal termination, after the same principle by which the reduplication-syllable of the preterite, in the Gothic, has only maintained itself in the roots with long syllables, but has perished in the short. We must con-
sider that the Sanskrit, in the reduplicated preterite has, in like manner, म mu, not मस् mas; but the Gothic, in this place, does not share the termination ma with the Sanskrit, but—as I believe, on account of the shortness of the antecedent vowel—has a simple m; hence, for instance, bund-u-m, "we bound," answering to वर्धन्यम bhandli-i-ma.

441. In the dual, the Sanskrit has vas in the primary forms, and va in the secondary, in analogy with the plural mas, ma. The difference between the dual and the plural is, however, so far an accidental one, in that, as we have before observed (§. 434.), the dual v is a corruption of m. This difference is, nevertheless, of remote antiquity, and existed before the individualization of the German, Lithuanian, and Scavonic, which all participate in this peculiar dual form. The Lithuanian universally has wa, the Old Scavonic, together with ba va, an inorganic feminine बा vye (§. 429): but the Gothic has three forms, and the most perfect in the subjunctive, where, for instance, bair-ai-va has the same relation to भरेक bhar-é-v, as, in the plural, bair-ai-ma to भरेक bhar-é-ma. The reason why the dual ending, in this position, has maintained itself most completely, plainly lies, as in the case of the plural, in the antecedent diphthong, which has felt itself strong enough to bear the syllable va. In the indicative present, however, the long ḍ which, in the Sanskrit bhar-ā-vas, precedes the personal termination, has, in the Gothic, shortened itself, in all probability, as, in the plural, bair-a-m, and, in the Greek, φέρ-ο-μες, contrasted with bhar-ā-mas: then, however, ḍ has permitted itself to be extinguished, and out of baira(conditional) as, by a union of both the vowels, bairōs has been generated, as ḍ, in Gothic, is the long form of a (§. 69.); and hence, in the nominative plural masculine of the a bases, in like manner ḍs is produced out of a त-स, so that, for instance, vairós, "men," answers to the Sanskrit virās, "heroes" (out of vira-as). In the indicative preterite we
cannot expect to meet with ōs, as this tense has for its connecting vowel not a but u; nor can we expect to meet with u-va, since va, like the plural ma, can be borne only by diphthongs or long vowels. The next in turn is u-v, as analogous to the plural u-m. At the end of a word, however, v is subject, where preceded by a short vowel, to be changed into u. Hence, for instance, thiuv, “servum,” (for thiuv), from the base THIVA; and thus, also, from u-v, first u-u, and next long ō, may have been generated, by the union of the two short vowels into one long. I therefore hold the u of magu, “we two can,” siyu, “we two are,” the only evidence for the form under discussion,* to be long, and write magu, siyu, as contractions of magu-u, siyu-v, from mag-u-v, siy-u-v. Should, however, the u of this termination be neither long nor the modern shortening of an originally long u, it would then be identical with that which stands as a connecting vowel in mag-u-ts, mag-u-m, or it would be explainable as magu from magva, siyu from siyva. Independently, however, of the phonetic impossibility of the last-mentioned form, [G. Ed. p. 638.] the immediate annexation of the personal ending to the root is incredible, because the first dual person would thus present a contrast scarcely to be justified to the second, and to all those of the plural, as well as to the most ancient practice of this tense. In Zend I know no example of the first person dual.

442. Of the middle terminations I shall treat particularly hereafter. The following is a summary view of the points of comparison we have obtained for the first person of the transitive active form.

* As mag is throughout inflected as a preterite, and also the verb substantive in both plurals, Grimm has, certainly with justice, deduced the form of the first dual person of all the preterites from the foregoing instances.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sanskrit</th>
<th>Zend</th>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>Latin</th>
<th>German</th>
<th>Lith.</th>
<th>Old Sclav</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>tishthdmi,</td>
<td>histdmi,</td>
<td>ἵστημι,</td>
<td>stō,</td>
<td>*stām,</td>
<td>stōm,</td>
<td>stōyn.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dadhami,</td>
<td>dadhami,2</td>
<td>δίδωμι,</td>
<td>do,</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>ēdīm,</td>
<td>damy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>asmi,</td>
<td>ahmi,</td>
<td>ἀμη,</td>
<td>sum,</td>
<td>im,</td>
<td>esmi,</td>
<td>yesyn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bharāmi,</td>
<td>barāmī,</td>
<td>φέρω,</td>
<td>fiero,</td>
<td>baira,</td>
<td></td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vahāmi,</td>
<td>vazāmi,</td>
<td>ἵστημι,</td>
<td>vēho,</td>
<td>viga,4</td>
<td>wezā,</td>
<td>wećun.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tishthēgam,</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>ἵστημι,</td>
<td>stem,</td>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dadydm,</td>
<td>daidhyaim,5</td>
<td>διδώμη,</td>
<td>dem,</td>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a)dyām,</td>
<td>haaim?</td>
<td>ε(α)ἰην,</td>
<td>siem,</td>
<td>siyau</td>
<td></td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bharēgam,</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>(φέρω),</td>
<td>fēram,</td>
<td>bairaiva*</td>
<td></td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>avaham,</td>
<td>vazēm,</td>
<td>εχο,</td>
<td>vēheb,</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>weżión,</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tishthāvas,</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dadvas,</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bharāvas,</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vahāvas,</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bharēva,</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>avahāva,</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tishthāmas,</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tishthāmasi,1</td>
<td>histāmahi,</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dadmas,</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dadmasi,11</td>
<td>dadēmahi,</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bharāmas,</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bharāmasi,11</td>
<td>bardmahi,</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vahāmas,</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vahāmasi,11</td>
<td>vazāmahi,</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tishyēma,</td>
<td>histēma,</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dadydama,</td>
<td>daidhyāma,</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bharēma,</td>
<td>barāema,</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vahēma,</td>
<td>vazāema,</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>avahāma,</td>
<td>vazāma?</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>weżéma.10</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 See §. 255. g.  
2 See §. 39.  
3 If δΧος, for Φχος, be related to εχο, then εχο also stands for Φχος, and belongs to vahāmi and vēho. The signification, also, of movement in the compounds ἀνεχο, δωχο, ἀνεχο, &c., is plainly perceivable; then the Sanskrit root vah signifies,

* The forms marked with * belong to the Old High German, the un-marked forms to the Gothic.
also "to bear," from which we easily arrive at the idea of "having." In Greek, however, it seems that, in this verb, two roots of distinct origin have intermixed themselves, namely, EX = वह vah, and ΣΧ (“sah), "to bear," with transposition of the radical vowel, as in βιβλίον, as related to BAA. If, however, εχω and σχω belong to one root, the first must then stand for σχω, with the loss of the σ. We must not, however, consider the spiritus asper of εχω, and of similar forms, as a substitute for σχω, as it is very satisfactorily explained by §104.

4 In p. 213 of my Glossary I have made the Sanskrit vah correspond to the Gothic vagyan, "to set in motion"; [G. Ed. p. 640.] but this vagya belongs, like the Lithuanian važ-δ-γυ, to the causal vahyati (§109 a. 6): the primitive of vagya has weakened in the present the radical vowel to i (p.106), and only appears in connection with the preposition ga (ga-vi-ga, ga-vag). In the Lithuanian, the a of važgyu, "I ride," rests on the long a of the Sanskrit vahyāmi; the e of vežō on the short a of važami. 5 Though, at the beginning of the Vendidad (Oslohauser's edition, p. 1,) the form daidyāvim belong to the Sanskrit root dvā, "to place"—which, if not by itself, at least in conjunction with वि� vi, has the meaning "to make," "to create"—still we deduce thus much from daidyāvam, that it is also derivable from da, "to give": unless the y has exercised no aspirating power on the antecedent d, in which case we should necessarily have daidyāvım. On the roots ज dā = ध दा, "to give," and जङ्ग dā = प dā, "to place," compare Burnouf's pregnant Note 217 to the Yaśna (p. 356), and Fr. Windischman's excellent critique on the same work in the Jena Literar. Zeit. July 1834. p. 143. 6 See § 430. 7 Or, without reduplication, duwa, as the analogue of the singular dūmi, together with which, also, a reduplicated form dūdu, but wanting the mi termination, is extant. 8 See § 441. 9 See § 255 e. 10 See Mielcke, p. 100. 11 Vedā dialect, see § 439. 12 See § 440. 13 Euphonic for dadymy, see Dobrowsky, pp. 39 and 539. 14 See §§ 440, 441.

SECOND PERSON.

443. The Sanskrit pronominal base twa or twé (§. 326.) has, in its connection with verbal themes, split itself into various forms, the t either remaining unaltered, or being modified to th or dh, or—as in Greek σό has degenerated into s—the v being either maintained or removed, the a remaining unaltered, or being weakened to i, or altogether displaced. The complete pronominal form shews
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itself in the middle voice, as this affects weightier terminations, and therefore has guarded more carefully against the mutilation of the pronoun, upon the same principle as that in which, in Sanskrit, the verbal forms which take Guna admit no irregular mutilations of the roots.

[G. Ed. p. 641.] For it is natural that a form which loves strengthening should at least, under circumstances which prevent that process, repudiate the contrary extreme of mutilation. Hence we say, for example, *asmi, “I am,” with the root undiminished, because the latter would receive Guna in the singular, if a would admit of Guna,* but we say, in the dual *swas, in the plural *smas, in the potential *sydm, because the two plural numbers and the entire potential refuse all Guna increment, and hence, occasionally, admit of radical mutilation. After the same principle, the pronoun of the second person shews itself in its most complete shape in the

* Upon Guna and Vṛiddhi see śī. 26. 29. I may here append, in justification of §. 29., what I have already indicated in my Vocalismus (p. ix), that I no longer seek the reason why a is incapable of Guna, although it may be compounded into long ā with an antecedent a, in the supposition that Guna and Vṛiddhi would be identical in the case of a—for a + a, as well as ā + a, give ā—but in this, that a, as the weightiest vowel, in most of the cases in which i and u receive Guna, is sufficient of itself, and hence receives no increment, according to the same principle by which the long vowels i and ā in most places remain unaltered where an a precedes i or u (Gram. Crit. ś. 34 a.). It is, moreover, only an opinion of the grammarians, that a has no Guna: the fact is, that a in the Guna, as in the Vṛiddhi degree, becomes ā, but on account of its weight seldom usesthis capability. When, however, this happens, i and u for the most part, in the same part of grammar, have only Guna; for instance, *bibhēda, “he clave,” from bhid, together with *jugāma, “he went,” from gam. It is, however, natural, that where so great an increment is required as that i and u become, not ē, õ (=a + i, a + u), but āī, āu, in such a case a should exert the only power of elevation of which it is capable: hence, for instance, we have *mānava, “descendant of Manu,” from manu, as *kāiva from kiva, and *kāuravya from kuru.
middle voice, namely, in the plural, where the primary forms end in dhwē, and the secondary in dhvam, and, in the imperative singular, where the termination swa has indeed allowed the T sound to vanish into s, but has yet preserved the v of twam, "thou." As we [G. Ed. p. 642.] shall have hereafter to consider the middle forms in particular, we now turn to the transitive active form. This has nowhere completely preserved the semi-vowel of the base twa, yet I believe I recognise a remnant of it in the th, which stands in the primary forms, as well in the dual as in the plural, and, in the reduplicated preterite, also in the singular. On the other hand, the secondary forms, as they generally have blunter terminations, so also they have, in the two plurals, the pure tenuis; hence, for instance, tishtē-ta, ἵςταῖτε, opposed to tishtē-tha, ἵςτατε; and, in the dual, tishtētam, ἵςταῖτον, opposed to tishtēthas, ἵςτατον. We see from this, that, in Sanskrit, the aspirates are heavier than the tenues or the medials; for they are the union of the full tenuis or medial, with an audible h (§. 12.), and tishtēthasa, must then be pronounced tishtē-hat-ha; and I think that I recognise in the h of the termination the dying breath of the v of twam, "thou."

444. The above examples shew that the full termination of the second person, in the dual present, is thas, and, in the plural, tha: we have, however, seen the dual, in the noun, arise by strengthening of the plural terminations (§. 206.). As, however, the personal terminations, being pronouns, stand in the closest connection with the noun, it might be assumed that the second person plural in the verb was once thas, and that the dual termination thās had developed itself from this; but that, in the lapse of time, the s had escaped from the thas, and the long vowel from the dual thās. We must consider that even, in the first person, the s of mas has but a precarious tenure, as, even in the primary forms, we often meet with ma. If,
however, in the second person plural, the original termination was *thas*, the Latin *tis* corresponds well to it, and it would confirm Thiersch’s conjecture, derived from the hiatus, that

[G. Ed. p. 643.] in Homer, instead of *tε* the termination *tες* may have stood as analogous to *μες* (Third Edition, §. 163.): As to the origin of the *s* of the termination *thas*, it is without doubt identical with that of *mas* in the first person: it is thus either to be divided as *th-as*, and as is to be explained as a plural nominative termination, or the *s* of *thas* is a remnant of the appended pronoun *sma* (§. 439.); as also, in an isolated condition, *yu-phemè*, “ye,” is found with *a-smē*, “we” (§. 332.). If the latter assumption be correct, possibly in the *m* of the secondary dual termination *tam* we may recognise the second consonant of *sma*; so that this appended pronoun has suffered a twofold mutilation, surrendering at one time its *m*, at another its *s*. In this respect we may recur to a similar relation in the Lithuanian dual genitives *mumā*, *yumā*, opposed to the plural locatives *musūse*, *yusūse* (§. 176.). As, however, the secondary forms, by rule, are deduced by mutilation from the primary, we might still—whether the first or the second theory be the true one of the termination *thas*—deduce the duller *m* from the livelier concluding *s*; as also in Greek, in the primary forms, we find *τον* from *χας* *thas*; as, in the first person, *μεν* from *mas*, *μες*, and, in the Prākrit फळ हिन from the Sanskrit भिस bhis (§. 97.). Thus, also, may the dual case-termination भ्यम bhyām have arisen from the plural *bhyas* originally by a mere lengthening of the vowel (see §. 215.), but later the concluding *s* may have been corrupted into *m*.

445. While the Greek already, in the primary forms, has corrupted the *s* of the dual ending *thas* into *v*, in the Gothic the ancient *s* has spread itself over primary and secondary forms; and we are able to deduce from this a new proof, that where, in Sanskrit, in the second person dual,
a nasal shews itself, this did not arise out of s till after the separation of languages. The a which preceded [G. Ed. p. 644.] the s has, however, escaped from the Gothic, and, in fact, in pursuance of an universal law, by which a before a terminating s of polysyllabic words is either entirely extinguished, or weakened to i. The first of these alternatives has occurred; and thus ts answers to the Sanskrit thas, as, in the nominative singular of the bases in a, vulfs corresponds to the Sanskrit vrikas and Lithuanian wilkas. Compare bair-a-ts with भर्पिḥ bhar-a-thas, φέρ-ε-τον, and further, buir-ai-ts with भेस्क bhar-έ-tam, φέρ-οι-τον. The Sclavonic has been compelled, according to §. 225. l., to give up the final consonant of the termination in question; the Lithuanian has chosen to do so: both, in fact, make ta correspond to the तम thas of the Sanskrit primary forms, as well as to the तम tam of the secondary. Compare the Sclavonic датта das-ta (see §. 436.), the Lithuanian дās-ta or дū̱da-ta, "ye two give," with दत्वस dat-thas, δείδο-τον; and дат̄д̄йд̄а dadv̄̄dȳ-ta,* "let you two give," дάδ̄йд̄э̱ дад̄ды̄-tam, διδ̄οῑτον, and Lithuanian дū̱do-ta, "ye two gave," with дад̄ды̄̄ дад̄ды̄̄-tam, δείδο-τον.

446. In the Zend, I know no example of the second dual person; but that of the plural runs as in the Sanskrit primary forms भाग thà,† and in the secondary मा ta. The Greek, Sclavonic, and Lithuanian have everywhere te, τε, te; the Latin has in the imperative alone weakened its tis to te

---

*§. 442. Note 13. Dobrowsky does not cite any dual: it is plain, however, from the plural дадъы-е, that the dual, if it be used, cannot sound otherwise than as given in the text.

† In the Zend we might explain the aspiration, according to §. 47., as a remaining effect of the earlier v: as, however, in Sanskrit, the semi-vowel is entirely free from this influence, we prefer for both languages the conjecture put forward p. 642 G. ed., that the h contained in the ठ is the real representative of the v.
The Gothic has everywhere \( th \), with the terminating vowel rubbed off: this \( th \) is, however, in my opinion, neither to be identified with the Sanskrit-Zend \( th \) of the primary forms, nor to be explained by virtue of the usual law of displacement by which \( th \) is required for the older \( t \); but very probably the Gothic personal termination, before the final vowel was abraded, was \( da \). The Gothic, in fact, affects, in grammatical terminations, or suffixes between two vowels, a \( d \) for the original \( t \), but willingly converts this \( d \), after the suppression of the concluding vowel, into \( th \) (see §. 91.). On the Gothic \( d \) just presupposed rests also the High German \( t \) (§. 87.), by a displacement which has thus brought back the original tenuis: hence we find, for instance, Old High German, \( \text{wё}g-a-t \), "ye move," answering to the Latin \( \text{veh-i-tis} \), Greek \( \dot{e}x-e-re \), (p. 639 G. ed. Note 3.), Lithuanian \( \text{wez-a-te} \), Old Slavonic \( \text{bezete} \) \( vеz-e-te \), Sanskrit \( \text{vah-a-tha} \), Zend \( \text{vamпha} \) \( vah-a-tha \), and presupposing in Gothic an older \( \text{vig} \) for \( \text{vigith} \).

447. We now turn to the singular. The primary forms have here, in Sanskrit, the termination \( श \) \( si \), and the secondary only \( स \) \( s \). Out of \( si \), however, under certain conditions, frequently comes \( shi \) (§. 21.), which has also been preserved in the Zend, where, according to §. 53., the original \( si \) is changed to \( hi \); as \( \text{vамвma} \) \( \text{bavahi} \) and \( \text{vамm} \) \( ahi \), "thou art," answering to भवसि \( bhavasi \), भव सि (for \( as-si \)): but भव \( \text{bavahi} \) and भव \( \text{ahi} \), "thou makest," answering to क्रियोपि \( \text{krindshi} \), as क्रि, according to the fifth class (§. 109a. 4.), would form. In the secondary forms, according to §. 56b., the concluding sibilant, with a preceding \( a \) \( a \), has become \( ख \) \( \\  \), and with \( \text{म} \) \( a \), \( \text{म} \) \( do \), but after other vowels has remained; hence \( \text{fraś-rāvayō} \), "thou spakedst" (V. S. p. 41), answering to प्राचार्यवस प्राचार्यवस, but \( \text{waś} \) \( \text{mraōs} \), "thou spakedst," answering

* I write \( \text{waś} \) \( \text{mraōs} \) purposely, and render \( \text{kh} \) by \( \delta \), because I now find myself compelled to adopt the remarks of Burnouf, founded on the best and
to abros, for which irregularly abravis  [G. Ed. p. 646.] abravis (Gram. Crit. §. 352.). Among the European cognate languages, the Old Sclavonic takes decided precedence for the fidelity and consistency with which it has preserved the primary termination si or shi, and so distributed them that the first has remained in the archaic conjugation, (§. 436.) the

and oldest manuscripts (Yaṣṇa, pp. lvii. lviii.), that ज as well as ज stands for the Sanskrit चो; the former, ज, however, only for the initial and medial, and always accompanied by the new Guna a (§. 28.)—thus always जा for an initial and medial चो,—and the latter, ज, only for a terminating चो and without the appendage of ज; as also before ज e at the end of a word no ज a is inserted. As a medial letter, ज appears sometimes as the representative of the Sanskrit च a, and is then produced by the influence either of an antecedent य or य (अन्य) ubōyō for उभोयो ubhayōs, p. 277), or it represents in the diphthong ज ओ, the a element of the Sanskrit च e (=a + i). As, however, ज in the purest texts is specially reserved for a position in the last syllable, it happens that, for the most part, it is, according to its origin, the solution of the syllable सस as, as this terminating syllable, in Sanskrit, becomes ओ only before sonants, in Zend always (§. 56 b). Yet I do not believe that it has been the intention of the Zend speech or writing to distinguish the Guna चो ओ, i.e. the ओ which springs from च u with a inserted before it, from that which springs from सस as, by vocalization of the स to u; for each ओ consists of च ओ, and upon the value and the pronunciation the question whether the च- or the ओ-elements was there first, whether an च has been prefixed to the च, or an च appended to the च, can have no influence. The position of a vowel in a word may, however, well have an influence on its value; and it is conceivable that the concluding ओ, kept pure from the Guna च, appeared more important than that which, at the beginning or middle of a word, had a prefixed. If the crude forms in च, in Zend as in Sanskrit, had Guna in the vocative (§. 205.), the concluding Guna-चो would also, as I believe, be represented in Zend by ज and not by ज। I can, however, as it is, discover no reason why a concluding चो in Sanskrit, produced by Guna out of च, should be represented in Zend in the one way or the other.
[G. Ed. p. 647.] latter in all the others. I subjoin the verbs of the archaic conjugation, with several examples of the more common, for comparison with the Sanskrit.

### OLD SACRED SLAVONIC

| बसी yesi, "es," | पश्चासी asi. |
| ददी dasi, 1 "das," | ददासी dadāsi. |
| मसी yasi, 1 "edis," | पश्चासी asi. |
| बंसी vyesi, 1 "novisti," | वेसी vēsī. |
| पीशी pieshi, "bibis," | पिवसी pivasi. 2 |
| चीशी chieshi, "quiescis," | चीशी chieshi, "quiescis," |
| स्मक्षी smyeyeshi(sya), "rides," | स्मक्षी smyeyeshi(sya), "rides," |
| वेशी vyeyeshi, "flas," | वेशी vyeyeshi, "flas," |
| जानकी नयेशी, "novisti," | जानकी नयेशी, "novisti," |
| बोषी boishi(sya), "times," | बोषी boishi(sya), "times," |
| डक्षी dyeyeshi, "fucis," | डक्षी dyeyeshi, "fucis," |
| जिवेशी shiveshi, "vivis," | जिवेशी shiveshi, "vivis," |
| हालेशी padeshi, "cadis," | हालेशी padeshi, "cadis," |
| वेशी ve2eshi, "vehis," | वेशी ve2eshi, "vehis," |
| चीशी spishi, "dormis," | चीशी spishi, "dormis," |
| चेशी recheshi, "dicis," | चेशी recheshi, "dicis," |
| त्रेशी tryaseshi(sya), "tremis," | त्रेशी tryaseshi(sya), "tremis," |
| कबेशी byedeshi, "affligis," | कबेशी byedeshi, "affligis," |
| नेशी neseshi, "fers," | नेशी neseshi, "fers," |
| जोबेशी ṣobeshi, "vocas," 8 | जोबेशी ṣobeshi, "vocas," 8 |
| डेशी dereshi, "excoris," | डेशी dereshi, "excoris," |
| गोशी proshishi, "precaris," | गोशी proshishi, "precaris," |
| गादीशी gadishi, "vitureras," | गादीशी gadishi, "vitureras," |
| सल्ही shkshishi, "audis," | सल्ही shkshishi, "audis," |
| जवेशी ṣevenishi, "sonas," | जवेशी ṣevenishi, "sonas," |
| नौशी pudishi, "pellis," | नौशी pudishi, "pellis," |
| वारोशी vartishi, "vertis," | वारोशी vartishi, "vertis," |
| बादीशी bādisi, "expergefacis," | बादीशी bādisi, "expergefacis," |
| स्मिष्की shmisishī, "nictaris," | स्मिष्की shmisishī, "nictaris," |

### SANSKRIT

| ददासी dadāsi. | पश्चासी asi. |
| वेसी vēsī. | पिवसी pivasi. 2 |
| स्मयेशी smayēsī. 3 | वासी vāsī. |
| जानासी jānāsī. 4 | विभेशी bibhēsī. |
| ददासी dadāsī. 5 | जीवासी jīvasī. |
| पातसी patasī. | वहासी vahasī. |
| स्वापिशी swapīśī. | वचासी vachāsī. |
| चनासी trasāsī. | विधासी vidhyāsī. |
| नायासी nayāsī. 7 | ह्यासी hwayāsī. |
| द्रृशासी drināsī, "laceras." 9 | पृष्ठासी prichchhasī, "interrogas," 10 |
| गदासी gadāsī, "loquieris." | गदासी gadāsī, "loquieris." |
| स्रीनासी śrīnāsī. 11 | स्वनासी swanāsī. |
| पादासी pādayāsī. 12 | वारासी varāsī. |
| बोपासी bōdhayāsī. | निपासी mīṣāsī. |

1 See § 436  
2 Compare पिवो pivō, "beer."  
3 A middle.
form, which is replaced in Sclavonic by the appended reflexive. According to the ninth class (§. 109*. 5.), but with irregular suppression of the \( n \) of the root \( jn\), which in the second class would form \( jn\ldots \), to which the Sclavonic form approaches more closely. 

5 Dhd “to place,” obtains, through the preposition \( vi \), the meaning “to make” (compare §. 442., Note 5). Perhaps, also, the Carniolan \( d\ell\am\), “I work,” is based on this root, so that it would stand for \( dedam \) (§. 17.), retaining the reduplication which is peculiar to the Sanskrit and Greek verb, as also the Lithuanian \( dedu \) with \( d\ell\).

6 Observe the favourite interchange between \( v \) and \( r \) or \( I \) (§. 20. and §. 409., Note 1): on this perhaps rests the relation of the inseparable preposition \( \mathbf{B} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{G} ra\ldots \) — which in several compounds corresponds in sense to the Latin \( dis \) (Dobr. p. 422, &c.) — to the Sanskrit \( \mathbf{B} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{H} \mathbf{I} \mathbf{S} \) \( vahis \), “out,” for \( \mathbb{H} \ h \) is frequently represented by the Sclavonic \( \mathbf{J} \mathbf{G} \), as in Zend by \( \mathbf{J} \mathbf{G} \); e.g. in \( vah\am\, \mathbf{J} \mathbf{S} \mathbf{M} \mathbf{U} \mathbf{G} \mathbf{H} \) \( vaz\am\, \mathbf{B} \mathbf{E} \mathbf{G} \), \( v\ell\mathbf{\ell} \). The Sanskrit \( vahis \), however, is found in Sclavonic in another form besides this, viz. with the \( v \) hardened to \( b \); hence \( \mathbf{B} \mathbf{E} \mathbf{Z} \), “without”; in verbal combinations \( b\ell \) and \( b\ell\mathbf{\ell} \) (Dobr. p. 413, &c.).

7 I have no doubt of the identity of the Sclavonic root \( nes \) and the Sanskrit \( n\ell \), which agree in the meaning “to bring”; and in many passages in the Episode of the Deluge the Sanskrit \( n\ell \) may be very well rendered by “to carry.” With reference to the sibilant which is added in Sclavonic observe, also, the relation of the root \( sly\ldots \), “to hear,” to the Sanskrit \( sru \) and Greek \( \mathbf{K} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{Y} \).

8 In the infinitive \( \mathbf{Z} \mathbf{B} \mathbf{A} t \) and preterite \( \mathbf{Z} \mathbf{B} \mathbf{A} c \) the Sclavonic form of the root resembles very strikingly the Zend \( \mathbf{S} \mathbf{C} \mathbf{M} \mathbf{M} \mathbf{M} \mathbf{S} \mathbf{M} \mathbf{S} \mathbf{Z} \mathbf{B} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{Y} \mathbf{B} \mathbf{M} \), a complex but legitimate modification of the Sanskrit \( h\mathbf{W} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{Y} \mathbf{\alpha} \mathbf{M} \mathbf{I} \mathbf{M} \mathbf{I} \mathbf{M} \) (§§. 42. 57.).

9 The root is properly \( dar \), according to the Grammarians \( \mathbf{D} \mathbf{R} \), and \( \mathbf{D} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{N} \) (euphonic for \( n\ell \)) the character of the ninth class (§. 109*. 5.). Compare Vocalismus, p. 179.

10 Remark the Zend form \( \mathbf{S} \mathbf{M} \mathbf{M} \mathbf{M} \mathbf{M} \mathbf{Z} \mathbf{M} \mathbf{Z} \mathbf{M} \mathbf{Z} \mathbf{Z} \) \( p\ell\ell\ell\ell\ell \). In Russian \( s\)-\( p\ell\ell\ell\ell\ell \) means “to carry.”

11 Irregularly for \( \mathbf{S} \mathbf{R} \mathbf{N} \mathbf{O} \mathbf{S} \), from the root \( sru \), with the character of the fifth class (§. 109*. 4.), and \( n \) euphonic for \( n \) [G. Ed. p. 649.] (comp. Note 2.).

12 The causal form of \( p\ell \), “to go.” The Sclavonic has \( \mathbf{d} \) for \( \mathbf{\alpha} \), according to §. 255. \( k \). The Latin \( p\ell o\) appears to me to belong to this root, with exchange of \( d \) for \( I \) (§. 17.), to which a following \( y \) may have assimilated itself—as, in Greek, \( \mathbf{D} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{L} \mathbf{L} \mathbf{O} \mathbf{S} \) from \( \mathbf{D} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{L} \mathbf{Y} \mathbf{O} \mathbf{S} \)—as a remnant of the causal character \( \mathbf{D} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{P} \) \( a \mathbf{Y} \) (§. 374.).

448. The Lithuanian has, in common with the Greek, preserved the full termination \( s \) only in the verb substantive, where \( e\ell-s\) \( s \) and the Doric \( \mathbf{\ell} \mathbf{S}-\mathbf{\ell} \mathbf{S} \) hold out a sisterly hand to
each other. In other cases the two languages appropriate the syllable in question so that the Lithuanian retains everywhere the i, the Greek, in accordance with the Latin and Gothic, the s. Compare the Lithuanian Cantidad with the Sanskrit Cantidad, Slavonic Cantidad, Greek Cantidad, and Latin Cantidad. Just as Cantidad has suppressed its radical vowel before that of the termination, so, in Mielcke's first and second conjugation, is the connecting vowel removed, while the third and fourth form a diphthong of it with i, as in the first person with the u; hence wež-i for weže-i, answering to the Sanskrit van-a-si, Zend vau-a-hi, Slavonic vež-e-shi, Latin vež-is, Gothic vug-i-s (§. 109. 1.), Greek vež-e-i, and its own plural vež-e-te, as dũda-te, answering to dũd-i; but yessk-a-i, “thou seekest,” analogous to the first person yessk-a-u. In the Greek, however, the i of the second person in the conjugation in ω has hardly been lost entirely, but has very probably retired back into the preceding syllable. As, for instance, γενέτειρα out of γενέτερια = Sanskrit janitri; μέλανα out of μελανια (§.119.), μείζων, χειρων, ἀμείων, for μείζων, &c. (§. 300. p. 415 G. ed.); so also τέρπ-ει-ς out of τέρπ-ει-ς = Sanskrit tarp-a-si. Or are we to assume, that in Greek the i has exercised an attractive force similar to that in Zend (§. 41.), and accordingly the antecedent syllable has assimilated itself by the insertion of an i, so that τέρπεις is to be explained as arising

[G. Ed. p. 650.] from an older form τερπεισι; I think not, because, of the i-forms extant now in Greek, no one exhibits such a power of assimilation, and, for instance, we find γένεσις, τέρπει, μέλανι, not γένεσις, τέρπει, μέλανι. The power which is not attached to the living i, is hardly to be ascribed to the dead.

449. The Lithuanian carries over the i of the primary forms also to the secondary, at least to the preterite, or has brought it back by an inorganic path to this place, which it must have originally occupied; so that, for instance, buv-a-i corresponds to the Sanskrit a-bhav-a-s, “thou wast.”
On the other hand, in the Slavonic the secondary forms are without any personal sign of distinction, since the final s of the cognate languages has been compelled to yield to the universal law of suppression of terminating consonants (§. 255. l.). Hence, for instance, the imperatives daža dašdi, "give," beža vežye, "drive," answering to the Sanskrit dadyás, vahés, Zend daidhyo (§. 442. Note 5, and §. 56b.), vazdis, Greek δδοίης, ἔχοις, Latin dēs, vēhās, Gothic vigais.

450. There remain two isolated singular terminations of the second person to be mentioned, फ धि and फ ठा. The former is found in Sanskrit in the imperative of the second principal conjugation, which answers to the Greek conjugation in μ; the latter in the reduplicated preterite of verbs in general. The termination dhi has, however, split itself into two forms; inasmuch as, in the common language, consonants alone have the power to bear the full dhi, but after vowels all that remains of the dh is the aspiration; hence, for instance, bhāhi, "shine," pā-hi, "rule," in contrast to ad-dhi, "eat," vid-dhi, "know," vag-dhi, "speak," yung-dhi, "bind." That, however, dhi originally had universal prevalence, may be inferred from the fact, that in Greek the corresponding θ; spreads itself over consonants and vowels, since we find not only ἴθος, κέκραξθι, ἀνωκθι, πέπεισθι, but also φάθι, ἵθι, στήθι, &c.: furthermore from this, that in Sanskrit, also, many other aspirates have so far undergone mutilation, that nothing but the breathing has remained; inasmuch as, for instance, the root dhā, "to lay," forms hita in the participle passive; and the dative termination bhyam in the pronominal first person, although at an extremely remote period, has been mutilated to hyam (§. 215.): finally from this, that in more modern dialects also, in many places, a mere h is found where the Sanskrit still retains the full aspirated consonant, as also the Latin opposes its humus to the Sanskrit bhāmi. My opinion hereon, already elsewhere established, that whereas it has formerly been assumed that the termination hi, as the original, has, after consonants, been
strengthened to dhi, this assumption is false, and conversely the dhi has been shortened, after vowels, to hi, is since then confirmed by the Vedic dialect, which I had not yet consulted; inasmuch as in this it is true the mutilated form hi* is already extant, but the older dhi has not retired so far to the rear as not to be permitted to connect itself also with vowels. Thus, in Rosen's Specimen of the Rig-Veda (p. 6), the form śru-dhi, "hear thou," answers remarkably to the Greek κλέθη.† The Zend also gives express confirmation to my theory, in that it never, as far as is yet known, admits of the form hi, or its probable substitute ži (§ 57.), but proves that at the period of its identity with the Sanskrit the T sound of the ending dhi had as yet not yielded. In Zend, in fact, we find, wherever the personal termination is not altogether vanished, either dhi or di; for instance, स्तुद्धि stūidhi, "praise thou," for the

[G. Ed. p. 652.] Sanskrit सुहि stuhi; क्रेन्द्धि kṛenudhi, "make thou," for the word, deprived of its personal termination, क्रिन् krinu; दधि daz-dhi, "give thou," (for देहि déhi), euphonic for dad-dhi, inasmuch as T sounds before other T sounds pass into sibilants (compare πεπεισ-θι, §. 102 concl.): to soft consonants, however, as Burnouf has shewn, the soft sibilants ž and zh alone correspond.‡ For दधि dazdhi we find, also, दाति dāti, for instance, Vend. S. p. 422; but I do not recollect to have met elsewhere with di for dhi.

451. How much, in Sanskrit, the complete retention of the termination द्धि dhi depends on the preceding portion of the word, we see very clearly from this, that the character of the fifth class (nu, §. 109*. 4.) has preserved the mutilated form hi only in cases where the u rests against two antece-

† Compare Rosen's remark on this termination, l. c. p. 22.—B. The retention of द्धि after a vowel is found also in the Mahābhārata as सपाकृषि "put away," "discard."—W.
‡ Yaçna LXXXVI. and CXXI. passim.
dent consonants; for instance, in ἀπνυθί, "obtain," from ἄπ (compare ad-ιπισκορ). Where, however, the u is preceded only by a simple consonant, it is become incapable of bearing the hi termination; hence, for instance, χίνυ, "collect," from the root χί. In this mutilated form the Sanskrit goes along with the corresponding verbal class in Greek, where δείκνυ, according to appearance, is in like manner without personal termination. The coincidence is, however, so far fortuitous, as that each of the two languages has arrived independently at this mutilated form subsequently to their separation. Nor is the Greek δείκνυ entirely without termination, but, as I conjecture, the i of the ending θι lies concealed in the δ, as also in the optative long v occurs for υ; for instance, δαυνύτο (II. xxiv. 665.) from δαυνυτό. It is not requisite, therefore, to derive δείκνυ from the ω conjugation, and to consider it as a contraction from δείκνυε; [G. Ed. p. 633.] and thus, also, to deduce τίδει, not from τίδεε, but from τίδετι, the τ being rejected, as τύπτει from τύπτετι, followed out from τύπτεται, and as κέρα from κέρατι; thus, also, ἵστη (for ἵστη) from ἵσταλθι, as Μούση from Μοῦσαι, λόγω from λόγοι (compare οἴκοι). If, also, δίδου be the contraction of δίδοε, we find also with it, in Pindar, the dialectic form δίδοι, which admits very well a derivation from δίδο(θ)i.∗

452. As the θ u of the fifth class, where it is not preceded by two consonants, has lost the capacity for supporting the personal termination dhi or hi; thus, also, the short a of the first chief conjugation, both in Sanskrit and Zend, has proved too weak to serve as a support to dhi or hi, and has laid them aside, as would appear, from the remotest period, as the corresponding Greek conjugation, The relation of δίδοι to δίδου is essentially different from that which exists between τύπτεως, τύπτοσα, and τύπτουσι, τύπτουσα; for here, as in μέλαις for μέλαι, out of μέλανς, and analogous cases, the i represents a nasal, which, in the ordinary language, has been melted down to υ, but also, in τίδεις for τίδεως, has become i. On the other hand, δίδου and δίδοι do not rest on different modifications of a nasal.
namely, that in ω, and the Latin and Germanic conjugations, collectively dispense with the personal termination. The Germanic simple (strong) conjugation also surrenders the connecting vowel; hence vig for viga, Sanskrit vah-a, Zend vāz-a, Latin veh-e, Greek ἤχ-ε.

453. We now turn to the termination य tha, of which it has already been remarked, that it is, in the singular, peculiar to the reduplicated preterite. In the Zend I know no certain instance of this termination; yet I doubt not that there, also, its prevalence is pervading, and that in a passage of the Izeshne (V. S. p. 311), in which we expect a fuller explanation through Neriosengh's Sanskrit translation, [G. Ed. p. 654.] the expression आभाक्यस्मि fra-dadhātha can mean nothing else than "thou gavest," as the representative of the Sanskrit pra-daddtha, (§. 47.); for in the second person plural, after the analogy of the Sanskrit and the Zend first person dadēmahi (§. 30.), the d of the root must have been extinguished, and I expect here आभाक्यस्मि das-ta for आभाक्यस्मि das-tha, insomuch as in the root आभाक्य sā, answering to the Sanskrit root आभास sā, (compare p. 111), so universally, in Zend, the Sanskrit य th has laid aside its aspiration after य s.* Among the European cognate languages the Gothic comes the nearest to the aboriginal grammatical condition of our family of languages, in so far that, in its simple (strong) preterite, it places a t as a personal sign, without exception, opposite to the Sanskrit tha, which t remains exempt from suppression, because it is always sustained by an antecedent consonant (compare §. 91.): we might otherwise expect to find a Gothic th answering to the Sanskrit th, yet not as an unaltered continuation of the Sanskrit sound, but because य th is a comparatively younger letter (compare p. 621), to which the Greek τ corresponds, 

* Burnouf, in his able collection of the groups of consonants ascertained to exist in the Zend, has not admitted the combination आभास sā (cā), but only आभास sē (cē) (Vend. S. p. cxxxviii).
and to this latter the Gothic \( \theta α \). If, however, the Greek, in its termination \( \theta α \), appears identical with the Sanskrit \( \varphi \) \( \theta a \), this appearance is delusive, for in an etymological point of view \( \theta = \varphi \) \( dh \) (§ 16.). While, however, this rule holds good elsewhere, in the case above, \( \theta \) is generated by the antecedent \( σ \), on the same principle as that which, in the mediopassive, converts every \( τ \) of an active personal termination, after the pre-insertion of \( σ \), into \( θ \). As to the origin of the \( σ \) which constantly precedes the ending \( \theta α \) [G. Ed. p. 655.]

I have now no hesitation, contrary to an earlier opinion,* in referring it to the root in \( \tilde{\eta}σ\thetaα \) and \( οισθα \), and in dividing them \( \tilde{\eta}σ-\thetaα \), \( οiσ-\thetaα \) (for \( oιδ-\thetaα \)). The former answers to the Sanskrit \( dś-i-tha \), for which we may expect \( dś-tha \), without the connecting vowel, which has perhaps remained in the Vēda-dialect. If this treatment and comparison, however, be sound, then is \( \tilde{\eta}σ-\thetaα \) also a remnant of the perfect, to which, too, the first person \( \gamma α \) for \( \tilde{\eta}σα= \) Sanskrit \( dśa \), belongs, and the ending \( \theta α \) thus stands in \( \tilde{\eta}σθα \) in its true place: just so, also, in \( oισ-\thetaα \), answering to the Sanskrit \( vēt-tha \) (for \( vēd-tha \)), “thou knowest,” Gothic \( vais-t \) for \( vait-t \) (§ 102.), and very probably to the Zend \( vāḷ-\thetau \) (see p. 94). The root \( विद \) \( vid \), in Sanskrit, has the peculiarity, demonstrated by comparison with the cognate languages to be of extreme antiquity, of using the terminations of the reduplicated preterite, but without reduplication, with a present signification: hence, in the first person, \( vēdą \) (not \( vivēdana \)), answering \( \tilde{\eta}δο \) to the Greek \( oιδα \) for \( Folda \), and Gothic \( vait \). In \( \tilde{\eta}δεισθα \) or \( \tilde{\eta}δησθα \), I recognise with Pott, as in all pluperfects, a periphrastic formation, and consider, therefore, his \( εισθα \) or \( ησθα \) as identical with the simple \( \tilde{\eta}σθα \). \( Ηεισθα \) is, as to form, a pluquam perfect: nevertheless, to the Sanskrit first augmented preterite \( \tilde{\eta}ς \), \( έυς \), \( ήιον \), \( \tilde{\eta}ιες \), correspond. In \( \epsilonφησθα \), how-


T.T
ever, and in dialectic forms like ἐθέλησα, the termination θα appears to me unconscious of its primitive destination, and, habituated by ἐσα, and ὀσ-θα to an antecedent σ, to have fallen back upon the personal sign Σ, which was ready to its hand.

454. In Latin, sti corresponds to the Sanskrit termination tha, with a weakening of the a to i, and the pre-insertion of an s, which has even intruded itself into the plural, where the s is less appropriate. On which account I consider it as a purely euphonic affix. Compare, for example—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LATIN</th>
<th>SANSKRIT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>dedi-sti</td>
<td>dadi-tha or dadda-tha.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>steti-sti</td>
<td>tasthi-tha or tashda-tha.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>momord-i-sti</td>
<td>mamard-i-tha, “thou crushedst.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tutud-i-sti</td>
<td>tutod-i-tha, “thou woundedst.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>peped-i-sti</td>
<td>papard-i-tha.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>poposc-i-sti</td>
<td>pprachch-i-tha,* “thou askedst.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Latin has preserved the ancient condition of the language more faithfully than the Greek in this respect, that it has not allowed the termination in question to overstep the limits of the perfect. The Lithuanian and Sclavonic have allowed the reduplicated preterite, and, with it, the termination, entirely to perish.

455. We give here a general summary of the points of comparison which we have established for the second person of the three numbers of the transitive active form.

---

* Compare the Sclavonic proshiti, “precari” (§. 447. Table.) The Sanskrit root prachchh, whose terminating aspirate in the case above Gram. Crit. §. 88.) steps before its tenuis, has split itself into three forms in Latin, giving up the p in one, whence rogo, interrogo, the r in another, whence posco (§. 14.), and retaining both in precor.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SANSKRIT.</th>
<th>ZEND.</th>
<th>GREEK.</th>
<th>LATIN.</th>
<th>GERMAN.*</th>
<th>LITH.</th>
<th>OLD SCLAV.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>asi,¹</td>
<td>ahi,</td>
<td>ēsǫi,</td>
<td>es,</td>
<td>is,</td>
<td>ēsii,</td>
<td>yesi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tishthas,</td>
<td>histahi,</td>
<td>īṣṇy,</td>
<td>stas,</td>
<td>*stās,</td>
<td>stowi,²</td>
<td>stōišī.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dadāsī,</td>
<td>dadhāhi,</td>
<td>dīdōs,</td>
<td>das,</td>
<td>dūdī,²</td>
<td>dasi.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bharasi,</td>
<td>barahi,</td>
<td>φépēs,</td>
<td>fers,³</td>
<td>bairis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vahasti,</td>
<td>vazahi,</td>
<td>ēxēis,²</td>
<td>vehis,</td>
<td>vigis,²</td>
<td>weži,²</td>
<td>vegeshi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a)syās,</td>
<td>hyāo,</td>
<td>(e)siθ,</td>
<td>siθs,</td>
<td>siyais,⁵</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tisiththō,</td>
<td>histois,</td>
<td>īṣṭaṇiθ,</td>
<td>stēs,</td>
<td>stōeki,⁷</td>
<td>stōi,⁸</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dadyās,</td>
<td>daidhyāo,</td>
<td>φidoθiθ,</td>
<td>dēs,</td>
<td>dūkī,²</td>
<td>dashdy,⁹</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bharēs,</td>
<td>bharōs,</td>
<td>φēpōs,</td>
<td>ferdas,</td>
<td>bairais</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vuhēs,</td>
<td>vuhōs,</td>
<td>ēxōiθ,</td>
<td>vehās,</td>
<td>vigais,²</td>
<td>wežki,⁷</td>
<td>vegi,¹⁰</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>avahās,</td>
<td>avahō,</td>
<td>ēiθxe,</td>
<td>vehebas,</td>
<td></td>
<td>wežēi²</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ēdhi,¹¹</td>
<td>aṣdi,¹²</td>
<td>ēsiθi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>viddhi,</td>
<td>vishdhi?¹³</td>
<td>ēsiθi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dēki,¹⁴</td>
<td>dazdi,¹⁵</td>
<td>dīdōbhi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>śrudhi,¹⁶</td>
<td></td>
<td>κλūdhi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vaha,</td>
<td>vahō,</td>
<td>ēxe,</td>
<td>veke,</td>
<td>vig</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ēsitha,</td>
<td>dōnitha?¹⁷</td>
<td>ēsōθa,¹⁸</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vētθha,</td>
<td>vēlθta?¹⁹</td>
<td>αθθa,¹⁸</td>
<td>vidisti,</td>
<td>vaist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tutdōththa,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>tutudisti,</td>
<td>staistaust²⁰</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bibbhdīthha,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>fidisti,</td>
<td>maimaist²⁰</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DUAL.**

tisiththas, histathō?²¹ | ēsṭarōv, |        | stōvita, | stōita. |
| bharathas, barathō?²¹ | φēpērov, |        | bairats  |        |
| vuhathas, vazathō?²¹ | ēxērov, |        | vēgastos, | vežeta. |
| bharētam,        | φēpōrov, |        | bairaits  |        |
| vahētam,        | ēxōrov, |        | vēgaitos, | wežki,⁷ | vežeta. |
| avahatam,       | ēiθxov, |        |         | wežēta  |        |

**PLURAL.**

tisiththā, histathā, | īṣṭarē, | statics, | *stāt |        |
| bharathā, barathā, | φēpēre, | fertis,²² | biarīth³ |        |
| vahathā, vazathā, | ēxēre,  | vehītis, | vigīth,²³ | wežātē, | vežete. |
| tisiththēta,⁵ | histalēta, | īṣṭānre, | stētis, |        | stōvēkite, | stōite. |
| dadyāta, daidhyāta, | dīdoθiθ, | dōtis,  | dūkite, | dashdite. |
| bharēta, barēta, | φēpōre, | serātis, | bairēth²⁸ |        |
| vahēta, vazalēta, | ēxōre,  | veḥātis, | vēgāith,²⁸ | wežki,⁷ | vežyeta. |
| avahata, vazata, | ēiθxe,  | vebebas, |         | wežētē. |

* See §. 442., Note *
Abbreviated from as-si. Correlates, with respect to the immediate connection of the personal termination with the root, to विभृतिः bibharshi of the third class (§. 109=. 3.). 

1. 2 See §. 448. 3 Corresponds, with regard to the immediate connection of the personal termination with the root, to विभृतिः bibharshi of the third class (§. 109=. 3.). 4 See §. 442. Note 5. This form is grounded on siy as its root; a is the usual connecting vowel (p. 105), and i the modal expression. More of this hereafter. 6 Tishthiyas, or, with the a suppressed, tishthiyas, would correspond with the Greek iorainys: but the root sthā treats its radical vowel according to the analogy of the a of the first and sixth class (§. 109=. 1.), and contracts it, therefore, with the modal character i or i, into e, as in Latin stēs out of stūis. More of this hereafter. 7 The Lithuanian imperative, also, like the Scavonic, rests on the Sanskrit potential. The i is thus here not a personal but a modal expression, but is generally suppressed in the second person singular; and Ruliig declares the form with i to be absolute. 8 See Dobr. p. 530. 9 See Dobr. p. 539, and the further remarks on the imperative of the Archaic conjugation. 10 See §§. 255. I and 433. 11 Out of ad-dhi, and this euphonic for as-dhi, तो-थि (Gram. Crit. §. 100.); so, below, ḍe-hi out of ḍad-dhi.

That, however, the form ḍe-hi has been preceded by an earlier ḍa-hi or ḍa-dhi, may be inferred from the Zend form dā-dī (see §. 450.), the first i of which has been brought in by the retro-active influence of the last (§. 41.). In Sanskrit, however, I no longer, as I once did, ascribe to the i of ḍahhi, ḍēhi, an assimilating influence on the antecedent syllable, but I deduce the ḍ from ḍ thus, that the latter element of a+a has weakened itself to i. I shall recur to this hereafter, when I come to the reduplicated preterite. 12 As रधि ḍēhi has sprung from ad-dhi, the latter leads us to expect a Zend form ṁghaz-dī, by the same law which has generated ṁghad-dī from ad-dī. 13 The here supposed फरदद्धतः fradadhāthā, from vid-dī, distinguishes itself from फरदद्धतः fradadhāthā, out of dad-di, through the influence of the antecedent vowel; for छ zh and झ z are, as sonant (soft) sibilants, so related to each other as, in Sanskrit, स s and छ sh among the surd (hard), see §. 21., and compare Burnouf’s Yaṣaṇa, p. exxi. 14 See §. 450., and above, Notes 11 and 12. 15 See §. 450. 16 Vēda-form, §. 450. 17 I have here, and also p. 654 G. ed., given a short a to the ending tha, although the lithographed Codex, p. 311, presents fradadhāthā with a long ā; but in the passage cited of the Izeshne there are many other instances of the short terminating a written long; for which reason I cannot draw from the form fradaddāthā the conclusion that the originally short personal-termination tha has lengthened itself in Zend, while elsewhere, conversely, the long final a of polysyllabic words has been shortened: compare p. 306 Note †. As to what concerns the supposed form ḍonhiṭha I have else-
where already cited the third person Astv^gus donhaWQata, ($. 66
b.), and expect accordingly Astv^gus donhitha.

The Gothic roots staut and mait have permanently substituted the Guna for the radical vowel, and thus preserved the reduplication: their concluding t for d satisfies the law of substitution, but the first t of staut is retained on its original footing by the pre-insertion of the euphonic s (§. 91.). With regard to the m of mait, as corresponding to the bh of bhid, look to §§. 62. and 215., and to the phenomenon, often before mentioned, that one and the same root in one and the same language has often split itself into various forms of various signification; for which reason I do not hesitate to consider as well bit, "to bite" (beita, bait), as mait, "to cut off," with its petrified Guna, as corresponding to the Sanskrit bhid, "to split."

The dual termination to, of which we have evidence for the third person, leaves scarcely room for doubt that thô belongs to the second person of the primary forms.

The pronominal base ta (§, 343.) has, after the analogy of the first and second person, weakened its vowel, in the singular primary forms, to i, and in the secondary laid it quite aside: the t, however, in Sanskrit and Zend, has, with the exception of the termination in us [G. Ed. p. 660.] nowhere suffered alteration, while, in the second person, we have seen the t of twa divide itself into the forms t, th, dh, and s. The Greek, on the other hand, has left the t of the third person in ordinary language unaltered only in ësãi = तसि asti, जःम asti, but elsewhere substituted a σ; so that, for instance, dh̄wσi more resembles the Sanskrit second person daddsi than the third daddâti, and is only distinguished inorganically from its own second person dh̄wσi, by the circumstance that the latter has dropped the i, which naturally belonged to it. That, however, originally τι prevailed everywhere, even in the conjugation in ω, is proved by the medio-passive termination ται; for as dh̄wσai is founded on dh̄wσi, so also is τέρπεται on τέρπ-ε-τι = Sanskrit tarp-a-ti. The form τέρπει has, however, arisen from a
rejection of \( \tau \), as above (§. 451.), \( \tau i \delta e i \) from \( \tau i \delta \eta i \), \( \delta i \delta o i \) from \( \delta i \delta o \), \( \kappa e \rho \eta i \) from \( \kappa e \rho \alpha r i \);* as also, in Prâkrit, \( b h a n a i \), "dicit," is used together with \( b h a n a d i \).† In the secondary forms the Greek, according to the universal law of sound, has given up the concluding \( T \) sound, and goes hand in hand, in this respect, with the Prâkrit, which, with exception of the Anuswâra (§. 10.), has repudiated all consonants at the end of words, as in the Gothic, §. 432., and the Sclavonic, §. 255. l.: hence \( \varepsilon \chi o i \) answers better to the Prâkrit form \( v a h \dot{e} \), and to the Gothic \( v i g a i \) and Sclavonic \( b e \zeta h v e z i \), than to the Sanskrit \( v a h \dot{e} t \), Zend \( \psi \lambda \gamma \lambda \psi \) \( v a z i \), and Latin \( v e h a t \), \( v e h e t \).

457. While the concluding \( T \) sound of the secondary forms in

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OLD SCLAVONIC.</th>
<th>SANSKRIT.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( k e t i b y ) yes-ty, &quot;est,&quot;</td>
<td>( \chi a t i a s-ti ).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( a c b e y ) yas-ty,§ &quot;edit,&quot;</td>
<td>( \chi a t i a t-ti ).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( b e c b e y ) yyes-ty,§ &quot;scit,&quot;</td>
<td>( \beta e t i ) ( v e t-ti ).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( d a c b e y ) das-ty,§ &quot;dat,&quot;</td>
<td>( d a d a t i ) ( d a d-a-ti ).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( v e c b e v e z-e-c-y, &quot;vehit,&quot;</td>
<td>( v a h \dot{e} t i ) ( v a h-u-ti ).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Perhaps \( o k o i \), too, is not an antiquated dative form for \( o k o \), but an abbreviation of \( o k o b u \).

† In the second imperative-person, also, the Prâkrit exhibits an interesting analogy to the Greek \( \tau i \delta e (\tau) \), \( \delta i \delta o (\theta) \), in the form \( b h a n a i \), "die" (Urvasi Ed. Lenz, p. 67), for \( b h a n a h i \), from \( b h a n a d i \).

† According to Dobrowsky, only in the Archaic conjugation; to Kopitar, also in the ordinary. He remarks, namely (Glagolita, p. 62), "Tertiae personae \( t b \) tam sing. quam plur. veteres, \( u t \) nos hic, \( p e r \) \( t b \) scribant. Hodierni \( p e r \) \( t b \)." § S euphonic for \( d \) (p. 608.)
The Lithuanian has, in the ordinary conjugation, lost the sign of the third person in the three numbers; hence wéz-a' corresponding to the Selavonic ve₂-e-ty and Sanskrit vah-a-ti; so, too, in the dual and plural. Those verbs only, which, in the first person, have preserved the termination mi (§. 435.), have, in the third also, partially preserved the full ti, or the t, and, indeed, at the same time, in direct combination with the root; hence, estii, "he is," důst, or důst',* "he gives," ést',* "he eats," giest',* "he sings," dest',* "he places," miegt', "he sleeps," sáugt', "he preserves," gelbt', "he helps," sérgt', "he protects," liekt', "he lets." This singular termination is also carried over to the dual and plural. The Gothic has, with the exception of ist, where the ancient tenuis has maintained itself under the protection of the antecedent $, everywhere th in the third person of the primary forms. This th, however, is not the usual substitute of t, but stands, as in the [G. Ed. p. 602.] second plural person (see §. 446.), euphonically for d, because th suits the ending better than d (§. 91.). In the mediopassive, on the other hand, the older medial has maintained itself in the termination da, which also agrees with the Prákrit ending di. On these medials rests, also, the Old High German t, by a displacement which has again brought back the original form.†

458. For the designation of plurality a n, which has been compared before with the accusative plural (§. 236.), is inserted before the pronominal character. After this n, the Gothic, in contradistinction from the singular, has maintained the older medial, since nd is a favourite combination. Compare sind with सैंति santi, सैंति henti, "sunt," and

* S euphonic for d, in accordance with §. 102. and with the Selavonic.
† In this sense is to be corrected what we have remarked on this head n §. 90.
The Sanskrit observes before the same vowel the same principle, which we have noticed above (§. 437. Rem.), with respect to the vowel-less m of the first person of the secondary forms. It pre-inserts, namely, an a when that letter or d does not already precede the pluralizing n in the class or radical syllable: hence, indeed, tarp-a-nti, like τέρπ-ο-ντι, tisht-a-nti like ἵστα-ντι, bhā-nti, “they shine,” like φα-ντί; but chi-nu-anti, “they collect,” not chi-nu-nti from chi; y-anti, “they go,” not y-nti* from i. Thus the Greek ἀσι out of αντι in δεικνύ-ασι, ἰ-ασι, τιθέ-ασι, διδό-ασι, acquires a fair foundation; for it is scarcely to be admitted that so striking a coincidence can be accidental. For even if the forms τιθεάντι, διδοάντι, ἱαντί, δεικνυάντι, are not maintained in any dialect, yet we cannot doubt that the length of the a in τιθεάσι, &c., as well as in ἵστασι and τετύφασι, is a compensation for a dropped v, and that σι, as everywhere in the third person, stands for τι. With regard, however, to the interpolated α, δεικνύασι and ἰασι coincide the most closely with the aboriginal type of our family of language, as in τιθεάσι the e, and in διδόασι the o, stand for the Sanskrit ḍ or a; for τιθημι = dadhami and διδωμι = dadami. These two Sanskrit words must originally have formed, in the third plural person, dadhā-n-ti, dadā-n-nti, or, with a shortened a, dadha-nti, dada-nti; and to this is related the Doric τιθέντι, διδόντι, as ἐντί to the Sanskrit santi. The forms τιθέασι, διδόασι, however, have followed the analogy of δεικνύασι and ἰασι, inasmuch as they

* The Indian grammarians assume everywhere anti, and, in the secondary forms, an, as the full termination of the third person plural, and lay down, as in the first person singular of the secondary forms, as a rule, that α of the class syllable of the first chief conjugation is rejected before the α of the ending; thus, tarp’-anti, for tarpάnti, out of tarp-a-anti. The cognate languages, however, do not favour this view; for if the Greek o of φερ-ο-ντι is identical with that of φέρ-ο-μες, and the Gothic a of bair-a-nd with that of bair-a-m, the a also of the Sanskrit bharanti must be received in a like sense as the long ḍ of bhar-ḍ-mas and the short of bhar-a-tha.
have treated their radical vowel as though it had not sprung from a. Thus the Ionicisms, ἰστέας, ἓας.

459. The Sanskrit verbs of the third class (§. 109*. 3.), on account of the burthen occasioned by the reduplication, which they have to bear in the special tenses, strive after an alleviation of the weight of the terminations: they therefore give up the n of the third person plural, and shorten a long d of the root, whence द्दत्ति dada-ти, "they give," द्दहति dadha-ти, "they place," जहति jaha-ти, "they leave." There is, however, no room to doubt that, in the earlier condition of the language, these forms were sounded dada-nti, dadha-nti, jaha-nti, and that in this respect the Doricisms दो-वति, तुर्व-वति, have handed down more faithfully the original type. The Zend also [G. Ed. p. 664.] protects, in reduplicated verbs, the nasal; for in V.S., p. 213, we read ṿवेंति dadentē, "they give," perhaps erroneously for dadentī.* If, however, the reading be correct, it is a middle verb, and not the less bears witness to a transitive dadentī. The Sanskrit, however, in the middle, not only in reduplicated verbs, but in the entire second chief conjugation, which corresponds to the Greek in μ, on account of the weight of the personal terminations, abandons the plural nasal; hence chi-nw-ατέ (for chi-nw-αντέ) contrasted with the transitive chi-nw-αντί. This also is evidently a disturbance of the original build of the language, which dates first from an epoch subsequent to the dispersion of tongues; for the Greek maintains in the mediopassive, still more firmly than in the active, the nasal as

* That, however, the suppression of the nasal is not foreign to the Zend is shewn in the form ṣेंहाति, "they teach," = Sanskrit शासति sāsati from the root शास sās, which, probably on account of the double sibilant, follows the analogy of the reduplicated forms. In Zend, the nasal (§. 56.*) placed before the h may have favoured the suppression of that of the termination. Upon the ज for जे see Burnouf's Yaçna, p. 480.
an expression of plurality, and not only opposes τέρπο-νται to the Sanskrit tarp-a-ntā, but also δίδο-νται, τίθε-νται, to the Sanskrit dadatē, dadhatē. Yet the Greek has, through another channel, found a means of lightening the excessive weight of the middle termination, by substituting νται where ανται would naturally be expected: hence δείκνυ-νται, not δείκνυ-ανται, which latter we might expect from δείκνυ-άσι (out of δείκνυ-αντί). The Sanskrit form stri-nu-alē and the Greek στόρ-νυ-νταί respectively complete one another, since the one has preserved the a, the other the nasal. The extrusion of the α from στόρ-νυ-(α)νται resembles that of the η of the optative, inasmuch as, on account of the increasing weight of the personal terminations, in the medio-

[G.Ed.p.665.] passive, we form from δίδοιν not δίδοιμην, but δίδοιμην. The Ionicism has, however, in the third person plural, sacrificed the ν to the α, and in this particular, therefore, harmonizes most strictly with the Sanskrit; in remarking which, we must not overlook that both, in their respective ways, but from the same motive, have generated their αλῆ, αται, out of αντή, ανταί; thus, στόρ-νῦ-α(ν)ται, together with στόρ-νυ-(α)νται, the first being analogous to the Sanskrit stri-nu-a(n)ntē. We do not, therefore, require, contrary to what has been remarked at p. 255, to assume that the α of πεπαώ-αται, and similar forms, is the vocalization of the ν of πέπαυνται, but πέπαυ-νται and πεπαύ-αται are diverse mutilations of the lost original form πεπαύ-ανται.

460. *The Old Sclovonic has dissolved the nasal in Dobrowsky’s first and second conjugation into a short u sound (as in the first person singular the m), and contracted this again with the antecedent connecting vowel, which elsewhere appears as e, but here is to be taken as o, to ɔ; so that χεβετιβ νεβύτυ† from νεβόντυ has a surprising resemblance

* Cf. (§.783.†).
† Dobrowsky writes BEZETT vežit, and gives, as in the singular, the y only in the Archaic conjugation (see p. 638. Note. †).
to the Greek ἐχοῦσι from ἐξοντι for ἐξοντι. The Bohemian wezau has, on the other hand, preserved the old a of the Sanskrit vah-a-nti, and the Gothic vig-a-nd, which, in the Latin veh-u-nt, by the influence of the liquid, has become u, in contrast to the i of the other persons (veh-i-s, &c.). The u of the Bohemian wezau, however, like the last constituent of the diphthong of वेण्यू वेण्य, is of nasal origin (§. 255. g.). In the Archaic conjugation the Old Slavonic has, with the exception of अवू अवू = सन्नि santi, "sunt," अनुन्ति henti, ēvri, abandoned entirely the nasal of the termination anti, but, instead, has maintained the a in its primary shape, yet with the pre-insertion of an inorganic y [G. Ed. p. 666.] (§. 225n.); otherwise dadaty, for which we find दादत्या dadatya, would be nearly identical with the Sanskrit ददति dadati: as reduplicated verbs have, in Sanskrit also, lost the nasal (§. 459.). बूदत्या vyadyaty, "they know," accords less with विद्यान्ति vidanti, and यादत्या yadyaty, "they eat," with जदत्य जदति adanti. This analogy is followed, also, by those verbs, which correspond to the Sanskrit tenth class (§. 109n. 6.), namely, Dobrowsky’s third conjugation, as बूदत्या बुद्य-यात्, "they wake" = Sanskrit भोष्याण्ति bōdh-aya-nti. Here, however, as the division and comparison given above shew, the y preceding the a is not inorganic, but belongs with the a to the character-syllable of the conjugation, of which more hereafter.

461. In the secondary forms the vowel has been dropped from the plural termination nti or anti, as from the singular ti, si, mi, and with this in Sanskrit, after the law had established itself so destructive to many terminations which forbids the union of two consonants at the end of a word (§. 94.), the personal character t was obliged to vanish, which in Greek, where even a simple t is excluded as a termination, had been already withdrawn from the singular. If thus ἔτερπ-ε finds itself at a disadvantage opposed to atarp-a-t—so, in ἔτερπ-ο-ν, compared with atarp-a-n (for atarp-a-nti)—the two languages, though from different motives, stand essentially on a similar footing of degeneracy. Ᾰο-αυ accords
still better with *ds-an*, and aorists like *ἐδείξαν* with Sanskrit tenses like the equivalent *adikshan*, as it would seem that the sibilant of the verb substantive has protected the old *a* of the termination *an* from degenerating to *o*; for the usual practice of the language would have given us to expect Ὑσον like *ἐτέρπον*, or Ὑσευ like τέρπον-ευ. The Zend goes along with the *ev* of the latter in forms like *ज्ञानं* *agnihón*, "they were," and *ज्यंसम्* barayėn, "they may [G.Ed. p.667.] bear"—φέροιεν. We see from this that the Zend also cannot support the weight of the termination *nt*, although it condescends more than the Sanskrit to concluding sibilants sequent on *r, c, f*, and *n*; and has handed down to us nominatives such as *अङ्कम्* ḍ́harr-s, "fire," *आक्षः* drucś, "a demon," *ज्वेदेघः* kercś, "body," ख्रीः baruṁs, "bearing." From the Gothic have vanished all the final *T* sounds which existed in the period previous to the German language (see §. 294. Rem. 1, p. 399 G. ed.). Hence, if in the present indicative *bair-a-nd* answer to the Sanskrit *bha-r-an-ṭi* and Greek φέρ-ο-ντι, we can nevertheless look for no *bairaind* or *bairai-an* in the subjunctive answering to φέροιεν(*τ*), Zend barayėn(!); and we find instead *bairai-na*, as would seem by transposition out of *bairai-an*, so that *an* corresponds to the Greek and Zend *ev, ēn* out of *an.* In the medio-passive the lost *T* sound of the active has preserved itself as in the Greek, because it did not stand at the end, but the vowel coming before, and, in Gothic, by transposition, after the *n*, is removed on account of the increscence of the ending; hence, bairaindau, as in Greek φέροιντο, not φέροιεντο (compare p.642).

642. The termination *un* of the Gothic preterite, as in ḍ́hahaitun, "they were named," may be compared with the Alexandrine *αν* for αντι, ἀσι (ἔγνωκαν, ἐπηκαν, &c.) with the recollection that the Sanskrit also, in its reduplicated pre-

---

* Or should we assume, that, as in the accusative singular (§. 149.), an inorganic *a* has been appended to the originally terminating nasal? The supposition of the text, however, accords better with the primitive grammar.
terite, although the primary endings belong to it, yet, under the pressure of the reduplication syllable, has been unable to maintain the original anti uncorrupted, but puts us in its stead. The s of this form is without doubt [G. Ed. p. 668.] a weakening of the original t: with respect, however, to the u, it may remain undecided whether it is a vocalization of the nasal, and thus the latter element of the Greek ou of τύπτονσι, or a weakening of the a of anti. The Sanskrit uses the ending us also in the place of an: first, in the potential, corresponding to the Zend-Greek ūn, ev, hence भरेयुष bharē-y-us (with euphonic y, §. 43) = ἐποίετος baray-ēn, φέροι-εύ; second, in the first augmented preterite of the reduplicated roots, thus, adadhus, “they placed,” adadus, “they gave,” for adadan (comp. ἔτιδευ), adadan; from which it is clear that us, since u is lighter than a (Vocalismus, p. 227), is more easily borne by the language than an. third, in the same tense, but at discretion together with ā-ṇ, in roots of the second class in ā, for instance, ayus, or ayāṇ, “they went,” from yā; fourth, in some formations of the multiform preterite, for instance, अस्त्रायुष्ण asrāyushus, “they heard.”

463. The Old Sclavonic could not, according to §. 255. l., maintain unaltered either the t or the n of the secondary form ant or nt: it sets in their place either a simple a or s; which last is to be derived from on. These two terminations are, however, so dealt with by the practice of the language, that a appears only after mā, s only after χ; for instance, ΜΧσ byechā or ΧΜΑ byesha, “they were” (§. 255. m.). The secondary form of the Latin has been handed down in most perfect condition, and has everywhere retained the pronominal t after the nasal which expresses plurality; thus erant outdoes the abovementioned forms चासन āsan, निसाव, and

* Of the termination ant only the t has been dropped, but the n is contained in the preceding nasalized vowel (see §. 783. Remark); hence we should read anī for a, unī for u.
VERBS.

\[ \frac{\text{646}}{} \]

646. In the dual of the Sanskrit the primary form is \( \text{tas} \), and the secondary \( \text{tám} \): to the former, \( \text{tov} \) corresponds in Greek, \( \text{§} 97. \text{—} \) thus \( \text{tarp-\(a\)-tas} \); but the termination \( \text{tám} \) has, according to the variety of the \( \Delta \) representation (§ 4.) divided itself into the forms \( \text{tov} \) and \( \text{taw} \), of which the former is the prevalent one, the latter limited to the imperative; hence \( \text{tarp-\(a\)-tov} \), \( \text{tarp-\(a\)-taw} \); \( \text{adik-\(a\)-tov} \), \( \text{adik-\(a\)-taw} \); \( \text{tarp-\(a\)-tov} \), \( \text{tarp-\(a\)-taw} \). From this remarkable coincidence with the Sanskrit, it is clear that the difference in Greek between \( \text{tov} \) on the one hand, and \( \text{tov} \), \( \text{taw} \), on the other, has a foundation in remote antiquity, and was not, as Buttmann conjectures (Gr. § 87. Obs. 2.), a later formation of the more modern prose, albeit in four places of Homer (three of which are occasioned by the metre) \( \text{tov} \) is found for \( \text{tov} \). The augment, however, cannot be considered as a recent formation merely because it is often suppressed in Homer, since it is common to the Greek and the Sanskrit. In Zend the primary form is regular, \( \text{ta} \) : for the secondary, however, which will be \( \text{tai} \), we have as yet no instance. The Gothic has lost the third dual person, but the Old Sclavonic has \( \text{ta} \), feminine \( \text{ta} \), as well for

* An instance is found in a passage of the Izschné (V. S. p. 48), the sense of which has been much mistaken by Anquetil:—

\[ \text{toda} \] maeghcmcha ydremcha yd t6 kährpem vacsayato (vide § 222.) barēnumus paiti gairinanm, “I praise the clouds and the rain, which sustain thy body on the heights of the mountains.” According to Anquetil, “J’adresse ma prière à l’année, a la pluie, auxquelles vous avez donné un corps sur le sommet des montagnes.” Vacsayato is either the future of \( \text{va} \), with an inserted \( \text{a} \)—thus for \( \text{vakshyatas} \) —or a derivative from the root mentioned, in the present, according to the tenth class; in either case, however, a third person dual.
the primary form तस्स (τας) as for the [G. Ed. p. 670.]
secondary तम् तम, τη, των (compare §. 445.); hence बेश्ता
vedeta, "they two ride," = नहतस् vahatas; बेषोτा vesosta,
"they two rode," = चवाज्ञम avāktam, euphonic for avākshtām,
p. 98; बेश्ता νένयेम, "they two sounded," = चवाज्ञम
aswanishtām. As to what concerns the origin of the last
letters s and m in the personal expressions तस्स तस and
तम् तम, they rest, without doubt, on a similar principle to
those of the second person यस thus, तम् tam; and if one
of the explanations given, §. 444. be valid, we must then abandon
the conjecture elsewhere expressed, that m of तम sprang
indeed originally from s, but first through the previous interven-
tion of a v (for u), after the analogy of चचवाम नवाम, "we
two," चचवाम नवाम, "ye two" (§. 340. Table, Dual, 1).

465. The following comparative table presents a summary
of the third person in the three numbers:—

SINGULAR.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>asti,</td>
<td>aste,</td>
<td>esti,</td>
<td>est,</td>
<td>ist,</td>
<td>esti,</td>
<td>yesti,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tishtati,</td>
<td>histati,</td>
<td>ἡστατι,</td>
<td>stat,</td>
<td>ττάτ,</td>
<td>stow,</td>
<td>stoity,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dadāti,</td>
<td>dadhāiti,</td>
<td>διδόρι,</td>
<td>dat,</td>
<td>δ०दि,</td>
<td>dāsti,</td>
<td>dasty,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>atti,</td>
<td></td>
<td>est,</td>
<td>itith,</td>
<td>īst,</td>
<td>īst,</td>
<td>yasty,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>barati,</td>
<td>baraiti,</td>
<td>फेर(τ)ि,</td>
<td>fart,</td>
<td>bairith,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vahati,</td>
<td>vazaiti,</td>
<td>ἡχ(τ)ि,</td>
<td>vehit,</td>
<td>vigith,</td>
<td>wezia,</td>
<td>veżyty,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a)n̄,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tishthet,</td>
<td>histōt,</td>
<td>ἱστατη,</td>
<td>stet,</td>
<td>stō,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dadyāt,</td>
<td>datdhyāt,</td>
<td>ददोइ,</td>
<td>det,</td>
<td>dashdy,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bharēt,</td>
<td>barīt,</td>
<td>फेर,</td>
<td>ferat,</td>
<td>bairai,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>avalat,</td>
<td>vazat,</td>
<td>वेहत,</td>
<td>vehebat,</td>
<td>wežé,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aswanīt,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DUAL.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)stas,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>īstov,</td>
<td></td>
<td>yesta,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tishthetas,</td>
<td>histatot,</td>
<td>ἡστατο,</td>
<td>στατον,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>stōit,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bharētam,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>φερότων,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bharatam,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>φερότων,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aswanishtam,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>νένυεστα,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* See p. 618, Note *
VERBS.

PLURAL.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sanskrit</th>
<th>Zend</th>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>Latin</th>
<th>German.*</th>
<th>Lith.</th>
<th>Old Sclav.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>santi,</td>
<td>hênti,</td>
<td>(σ)eντι,</td>
<td>sunt,</td>
<td>sind,</td>
<td></td>
<td>suñty,*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tishṭhanti,</td>
<td>histênti,</td>
<td>ἱστὼντι,</td>
<td>stant,</td>
<td>+stánt.</td>
<td></td>
<td>stoyanity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>daduți,</td>
<td>dadênti,</td>
<td>διδόντι,</td>
<td>dant,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>dadyanity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bharanti,</td>
<td>barredtī,</td>
<td>φέρουντι,</td>
<td>ferunt,</td>
<td>bairand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vuhanti,</td>
<td>vazênti,</td>
<td>ἕχοντι,</td>
<td>vehunt,</td>
<td>vigand,</td>
<td></td>
<td>vequinity.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tishṭhēyus,12</td>
<td>histayēn,</td>
<td>ἱσταίεν,</td>
<td>stent,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bharēyus,12</td>
<td>barayēn,</td>
<td>φέρειεν,</td>
<td>ferant,</td>
<td>bairaina13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>āsan,</td>
<td>anhēn,</td>
<td>ἤσαν,</td>
<td>erant,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>atarpishus,</td>
<td>ēṭēρψαν,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>terpyeshan.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aswanishus,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ėvenyeshan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alikshan,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>lokushan,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 See §. 456.  
2 Answers to बिभार्ति bibharti, third class, p. 636, 3.  
3 Without personal sign: see §. 457.  
4 See p. 636, 4.  
5 P. 636, 6.  
6 First person, aswanisham, “I sounded.”  
7 See §. 464.  
8 As in the singular; see §. 457.  
9 See §. 225. g.  
10 See §. 459.  
11 See §. 459.  
12 See p. 645.  
13 See p. 644.  
14 Tarpyeti means “to suffer,” “to bear,” so that the original signification appears to be inverted: compare the Gothic thaurban, “to need” (Vocalismus, p. 170). The Sanskrit root tar (tarp) means, according to the fifth class (trip̣ámi), “to be content, satisfied”; according to the first (tarpámi), tenth (tarpayámi), and sixth (tripámi), “to rejoice,” “to content,” &c.

MIDDLE TERMINATIONS.

[G Ed. p. 672.] 466. The middle terminations, in which the passive participates, distinguish themselves throughout from those of the transitive-active by a greater fulness of form, even though the mode of formation be not always the same. Sanskrit, Zend, and Greek accord in this, that they lengthen a concluding i, in the primary forms, by the pre-insertion of a: hence, μαυ from μ, σαι from the σι which remains uncorrupted only in ἐσοὶ of the second person (§. 449.), ταῦ from τι, and, in the plural, νταῦ from ντι. The Sanskrit and Zend make their diphthong é correspond to the Greek ά; and this applies to the rare cases in which the é produced by a + i is represented in Greek by αι, as usually the first element of the Indo-Zend diphthong appears, in Greek,
in the shape of e or o (see Vocalismus, p. 196). The weightier and original a seems, however, in the terminations of the middle voice here spoken of (cf. §. 473.), where expressive fulness of form is of most importance to the language, to have been purposely guarded. The Gothic has lost the i element of the diphthong ai; hence, in the third person, da for dai; in the second, za (euphonic for sa, §. 86. 5.) for zai; and in the third person plural, nda for ndai. The first person singular and the first and second of the plural have perished, and are replaced by the third, as our German sind, which, pertaining only to the third person plural, has penetrated into the first. The a which precedes the personal termination, as in hait-a-za, “vocaris,” hait-a-da, “vocatur,” as opposed to the i of haitis, “vocas,” haitith, “vocat,” formerly appeared mysterious, but has since, to my mind, fully ex- plained itself, by the assumption that all Gothic verbs of the strong form correspond to the Sanskrit first or fourth class (p. 105), and that the i of haitis, haitith, is a weakening of an older a, conformable to rule, and the result of a retro-active influence of the terminating s and th (§. 47.). The medio- passive, however, found no occasion for a necessary avoidance of the older a sound, and it therefore continues, in this particular, in the most beautiful harmony with the Asiatic sister idioms.

467. The Sanskrit and Zend have lost in the first person singular, as well as the primary as the secondary forms, the pronominal consonant, and with it, in the first chief conjugation, the a of the class-syllable (see §. 435.); hence बोधे, “I know,” for bôdh-a-mé or bôdh-a-mê, in case the weightier personal ending has impeded the lengthening of the class-vowel mentioned in §. 434. Compare—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SANSKRIT.</th>
<th>ZEND.</th>
<th>GREEK.</th>
<th>GOTHIC.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>मे bhar-े</td>
<td>है bair-े</td>
<td>φέρ-ο-μαί</td>
<td>. . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>मरे bhar-a-से</td>
<td>हैं bhar-a-हे</td>
<td>(φέρ-ε-σαί), φέργ, bair-a-za.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>मरे bhar-a-ते</td>
<td>हैं bhar-a-ते</td>
<td>φέρ-ε-τα,</td>
<td>bair-a-du,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>मरे bhar-a-न्ते</td>
<td>हैं bhar-a-न्ते</td>
<td>φέρ-ο-νταί,</td>
<td>bair-a-nda.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VERBS.

In the passive the third person plural often occurs as "nascuntur," (Vend. S. p. 136), with ë for a, through the influence of the preceding y (§ 42.). For the middle I have no instance of this person: we might, however, at the utmost be in doubt whether we should use barëntë after the analogy of the transitive barëntî, or baraintë. Both are possibly admissible, but baraintë appears to me the safest, as in the active transitive, also, aînti is extant as well as ënti, especially after v, where ënti would, perhaps, not be allowed: hence,

\[ \text{[G. Ed. p. 674].} \]

The Sanskrit-Zend forms have a striking likeness to the Gothic bair-a-da, bair-u-nda, given above. Yet I am not hence disposed, as formerly,\* to adjust the Gothic primary to the Sanskrit secondary forms, and to make the comparison between bair-a-da, bair-a-nda, (instead of bhar-a-të, bhar-a-ntë), and abhar-a-ta, abhar-a-nta. The termination au, in the Gothic subjunctive, is puzzling; where, for instance, bair-ai-dau is opposed to the Sanskrit bhar-a-ta, Zend bar-a-ta, Greek φερ-οι-το; and thus, in the plural, bair-ai-ndau answers to φερ-οι-ντο; and, in the second per-

\* Conjugation System, p. 131.

† In Zend the active bar-ay-ên would lead us to expect a middle bar-a-b-na (compare § 461.). The Sanskrit, departing from the sister languages, has the termination ran, thus bhar-ë-ran, which seems to me a mutilation of bhar-ë-ranta. The root ëë, "to sleep," "to lie," inserts anomalously such an r, as here precedes the proper personal ending, in the third person of all special tenses (§ 109d.), suppressing, however, in the present impe-
son singular, *bair-ai-zau* to *φέρ-οι-(σο).* [G. Ed. p. 676]

It is not probable that this *au* has arisen out of *a* by the inorganic addition of a *u*, as the corruptions of a language usually proceed rather by a wearing off than an extending process. I think, therefore, that the termination *au* of the imperative, where it has already attained a legal foundation (p. 597), has insinuated itself into the subjunctive; that thus the speakers, seduced by the analogy of *bair-a-dau*, *bair-a-ndau*, have used *bair-ai-dau*, *bair-ai-ndau*, also in the subjunctive; and that thence the *au* has made its way into the second person singular, thus *bair-ai-zau* for *bair-ai-za*. This ought not to surprise, as the medio-passive in the Gothic has already got into confusion in this respect, that the first person, and, in the plural, the second also, has been entirely displaced by the third.

469. In the second person singular of the secondary forms the Sanskrit diverges from the principle of the third and first. Just as *ta* stands opposite to the primary *thel* and the secondary *t* of the transitive active, so we should expect *sA* as a counterpart to *së* and *s*. In its place, however, we find *thds*; thus, for instance, *abhōdh-a-thās*, "thou knewest," *bhōdh-th-thās*, "thou mayest know." That, however, originally there was a form *sa* co-existent with this *thās* is indicated, not only by the Greek, in which *ἔδιδο-σο, δίδοι-σο*, accord exactly with *ἐδίδο-το, δίδοι-το*, but also by the Zend, which exhibits *ῳ ha* in places where, in Sanskrit *Ś sa* would be to be expected, the *�� h* being a regular correspondent to *Ś s* (§. 53.), and *ῳ śa* after such vowels as, in Sanskrit, require

imperative and first augmented preterite, according to §. 459., the nasal of plurality; hence *ἐθ-ra(n)thel = kei-vrai*; potential *say-i-ran*, imperative *ἐθ-ra(n)tām*; preterite *aše-ra(n)ta = ēkūto*. We shall hereafter recognise such an *r* in the middle of the reduplicated preterite. As to its origin, however, I conjecture it to be the radical consonant of the verb substantive, with an anomalous exchange of *s* for *r* (comp. §. 22.), so that, for instance, *dad-i-ran*, for *dad-i-ranta*, would run parallel with the Greek active *διδοίσαν*, to which would pertain a medio-passive *διδοίσαντο* or *διδοίσαντο*.
the conversion of the s into sh (p. 20). The termination ha has.

[G. Ed. p. 676.] according to §. 56*, an n prefixed, and thus it occurs in the passive form noticed in my first Zend attempt (Berlin Jahrb. March 1831, p. 374), and still hitherto unique, usazayanha, “thou wast born” (Vend. S. p. 42). Anquetil translates the passage, which cannot admit two interpretations, ηυσάζαυανὰ ἥ τὸν usazayanha, “to him thou wast born,” by “lui qui a eu un fils célèbre comme vous,” and thus conceals the true grammatical value of this remarkable expression, which was perhaps no longer intelligible even to Anquetil’s Pārsī instructors. I have since been unable to find a second instance of this form; but Burnouf (Yaçna, Notes, p. 33) has brought to light a middle aorist form of no less importance, namely, мзпхджу urûrudhusha, “thou grewest,” to which we shall recur hereafter. At present we are concerned only with the substantiation of the termination sh, the sh of which is used under the euphonic influence of a preceding u.

470. We return to the Sanskrit termination thás. This stands in obvious connection with the active termination tha, discussed §. 453., which probably had, in its origin, a still farther extension in the singular, and from which the form thâ-s arose, by elongation of the vowel and the addition of s; which s, as elsewhere noticed (Gram. Crit. §. 301. d.), probably stands also to designate the second person. If this be so, then either the first or the second personal-expression would designate the person, which sustains the operation of the action or its advantage, which in all middle forms is forthcoming at least in spirit if not in form. Thus in adat-thâs, “thou gavest to thee” (tookest), either “thou” is designated by td, and “to thee” by s, or the converse.

[G. Ed. p. 677.] If this be so, and if in the Greek first person the ν of the termination μην (Doric μᾶν) be organic, i.e. not a later nugatory addition, but intentional, and a legacy of the primeval period of our race of languages, then ἐδιδόμην also signifies “I gave to me,” whether it be that μη (μᾶ) or, as seems to me more probable. the ν expresses the subjective
relation: in either case, however, \( \mu \eta \cdot v \) (\( \mu \dot{\alpha} \cdot v \)) stands, even with respect to the length of the vowel, in perfect analogy to the Sanskrit \( t\ddot{a}-s \). To this we must add, as an analogy for the third person, the termination \( \text{त्रत्त } t\dot{a}-t \) of the Vēda-dialect, where the expression of the third person stands doubled. I therefore hold this remarkable termination for a middle one, although Pānini (VII. 1. 35.) gives it as a substitute for the transitive imperative terminations \( t\dot{u} \) and \( h\dot{i} \), which occur in benedictions; for instance, \( bhavan \ j\dot{i}va\dot{t}at \), "May your honour live!" (respectful for "mayest thou live"). It is true the root \( j\dot{i}v \) (and perhaps many others with the ending \( \dot{a}t \)), is not used in the ordinary language in the middle voice, but this termination may be a remnant of a period in which all verbs had still a middle voice. The middle is, moreover, in its place in blessings, in which some good or advantage is always invoked for some one. Finally, \( t\dot{a}t \), in a formal respect, is much nearer to the usual middle imperative termination \( t\ddot{a}m \) than the transitive \( t\dot{u} \); yet I do not believe that \( t\dot{a}t \) has arisen out of \( t\ddot{a}m \), but rather that the converse has taken place, perhaps by the intervention of an intermediate \( t\ddot{a}s \) (compare §. 444.). However this may be, the termination \( t\dot{a}t \), which Burnouf's acuteness has detected also in Zend,† is of importance, because it affords an ancient foundation for the Oscan imperative in \( t\ddot{u}d \).‡ preserved to us in the table of Bantia, as \( l\text{ic}i\text{tu}-d \) for

* Possibly the representation of the termination \( h\dot{i} \) by \( t\dot{a}t \) may be so understood, as that in sentences like \( bhavan \ j\dot{i}va\dot{t}at \), "May your honour live!" the person addressed is always meant. Examples are not adduced in which the actual second person is expressed by \( t\dot{a}t \). Should such exist, we should be obliged here to bring back the two \( t \) to the base \( t\ddot{u}na \) of the second person, while in the \( t\dot{a}t \) of the third person both belong to the demonstrative base \( t\ddot{a} \) (§. 343.). Cf. §. 719. p. 956, Note.

† Only in one instance of value, \( \text{सु} \text{म}\text{र} \text{ज} \text{व} \text{स} \text{र} \text{स} \text{त} \). (Yaçaṇa, p. 508, Note).

‡ Compare the ablative in \( u\ddot{d} \); answering to the Sanskrit-Zend in \( \dot{a}t, \dot{a}t \), and the Old Latin in \( o\cdot d \).
liceto, estu-d for esto, ἐστω.* To the Greek imperative termination ῥω a middle origin has been already elsewhere ascribed; for in the plural, τερπ-ό-ντων accords perfectly with the Sanskrit middle tarpa-ntām, and is related to it as τερπ-έ-των to the purely active dual tarpa-tām. Should, however, τερπ-ό-ντων be identical with the transitive tarpa-ntu, this would be a solitary instance in the whole grammar of the Greek language, of ω corresponding to a Sanskrit u, with, moreover, an inorganic accession of a nasal. We should be more inclined in τερπετω —if we compare it to the middle tarpa-tām—to admit the abrasion of a nasal sound, as in ἐδειξα, opposed to अदिक्षम adikṣham. I now, however, prefer to identify τερπετω with the Vedic word tarpatāt, for the abandonment of the τ was compulsory, that of the nasal an accidental caprice.

[G. Ed. p. 679.] The relation of τερπ-έ-τω to tarpa-tāt would be similar to that of ἐδιῶ, ἔδω, to adadāt, adāt. If, however, τερπετω be identical with tarpatāt and Oscan forms like licitud, estud, the view we have mentioned above, that the Vēda-ending tāt belongs properly to the middle, acquires a new support; for if τερπόντων is based on tarpantām, and is therefore of middle origin, then its singular counterpart, also, can belong to no other verbal genus, and will prove a similar origin for that of its Asiatic prototype tarpatāt.

471. The first person singular of the secondary forms ought, in Sanskrit, after the analogy of the third in tā, to be ma, so that bharēma would be the counterpart of the Greek

* It deserves remark, that Dr. Kuhn, in his lately-published work, "Conjugatio in μυ, linguae Sans. ratione habita" (p. 26, obs.), has ascribed to this Oscan form, without recognising its Vēdic analogue, a passive origin. The Oscan affects a concluding d for t, but has maintained the old tenuis under the protection of a preceding s; hence the subjunctive forms such as fust, opposed to fluid (see O. Müller's Etrusker, p. 87). Compare, in this particular, the Gothic ist (p. 661 G. ed.) with bairith, bairada.
This form, if not the oldest, must have been of long standing in Sanskrit. In the present condition, however, of the language, the \( m \), as everywhere in the singular of the middle, has given way, and for \( bhārē(m)ā \) we find \( bhārē-y-ā \), with euphonic \( y \), which is inserted before all personal terminations beginning with vowels, in both active forms of the potential (compare §. 43.). In the forms burthened with an augment, the termination \( a \), already much mutilated, has experienced a further weakening by the transition of \( a \) into \( i \); hence, e.g., \( astri-ν-ι \), "sternebam," for \( astri-ν-α \), and this from \( astrīnu-ma \), or a still older \( astrīnu\-mām \), which would correspond to the Doric \( ἐστορ-νέ-μαν \).

472. We return to the primary forms, in order to remark, that, in Sanskrit, not merely those forms end in \( e \) which, in the transitive active, end in \( i \), and above have been classed opposite the Greek middle forms in \( α \); but also those which, in the transitive active, exhibit no \( i \), and, in the Greek middle, no \( α \). The collective primary forms run—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SINGULAR</th>
<th>DUAL</th>
<th>PLURAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( mē=μα )</td>
<td>( vahē )</td>
<td>( mahē=μεθα )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( sē=σα )</td>
<td>( āṭhē )</td>
<td>( dhvē )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( tē=τα )</td>
<td>( āṭē )</td>
<td>( ntē or atē=ντα ), ( at) (§. 459.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Zend follows, as far as evidence exists, the analogy of the Sanskrit, yet the first person plural is not \( māzē \), as would be expected from \( महे \) \( mahē \), but \( maidē \) (§. 41.);* from which it is clear, that the Sanskrit \( mahē \) is a mutilation of \( महे \) \( madhē \) (§. 23.), as, before I studied Zend, I had already inferred from the Greek \( μεθα \). The Greek \( μεθα \), however, has on its side lost the terminating \( i \), and thus ranks with the Gothic forms, mentioned §. 467. In the secondary forms, \( महे \) \( mahē \) weakens itself by the loss

* \( Maidē \), also, occurs with the aspiration dropped.
of the initial element of the diphthong \( \ell \) to \( mahi \); on the other hand it extends itself, in a manner which argues a propensity to the greatest fulness of form, in the first person imperative to ज्ञात ॐङ्ग दमहादी; and analogous to this the dual exhibits together with बहे वाहे the forms वाहि and नवाहाद। The Zend retains, also, in the secondary forms, the full termination माइड़हे; at least there is evidence of this last in the potential बुढन्या माइड़हे, "we may see," (Vend. S., p. 45) repeatedly.

473. Though, in Sanskrit, all the middle terminations of the primary forms end in \( \ell \), I am not of opinion, therefore, that all these \( \ell \) rest on the same principle. As to those to which, in the transitive active, \( i \), and, in the Greek middle,

\[ \text{[G. Ed. p. 681.]} \] \( \alpha \), corresponds, I am much inclined to assume the dropping of a pronominal consonant between the two elements of the diphthong,* and, indeed, to derive \((m)\ell\), \( \mu\alpha \), from \( mami \); \( s\ell\), \( \sigma\alpha \), from \( sasi \); \( t\ell\), \( \tau\alpha \), from \( tati \); as we have before seen तूतेतु तूतेतु, \( \tau\upsilon\tau\eta\upsilon\eta \), and, in the Prākrit, भणाई from भणादी; and as, also, in the Greek, the middle तूतेसौ has been still further shortened into तूतसौ, \( \tau\upsilon\tau\eta\upsilon\sigma\alpha \), and, in Sanskrit, \( m\ell \) into \( \ell \). In this \( \ell \), therefore, the expression of the first person is contained in a twofold manner, once in \( a \) for \( ma \), and then in \( i \) for \( mi \); and thus, also, the reduplicated preterite in the third person exhibits \( \ell \) opposite the Greek \( \tau\alpha \) for \( \tau\eta\tau \), and the Veda-dialect gives us, even in the present for से-तेवः वीतः, \( s\ell-t\ell=\kappa\eta\tau\alpha \), of the ordinary language, the form सताते (euphonic for सतै्र), and other similar mutilations of the terminations of the middle voice, as aduh, "they milked," for aduh-ata; दुहाम, "let him milk," for दुहात्-हात्, and this last euphonic for दुहा-ताम (Panini VII. 1. 41.) If we now refer \((m)\ell=\mu\alpha \), \( s\ell=\sigma\alpha \), and \( t\ell=\tau\alpha \), to the probably pre-existing forms \( mami \), \( sasi \), \( tati \), perhaps,

* So, also, Kuhn in his Tract (p. 25), mentioned at p. 654.
also, māmi, sāti, tāti,* the question arises which of the two pronouns expressed the subjective, and which the objective relation. Do dat-sa(s)i, dīḍo-σα(σ)i signify “give to thee thou,” or “give thou to thee”? If we assume the former, we obtain the same order as in dīḍosθe, dīḍosθov, &c., of which more hereafter; and the remarkable case would occur, that, after the suppression of the second pronominal consonant, the first, which, with its vowel, expressed the pronoun standing in the relation of the oblique case, has obtained the appearance of designating the subjective, [G. Ed. p. 682.] or of belonging to the proper personal termination; for, in dīḍo-μα(μ)i, the feeling of the language would better dispense with the expression of the “to me” or “me” (accusative) than with that of “I.” Whichever of the two explanations be true, it is thought we find in dīḍo-μαi the same μ as in dīḍω-μ. That this should so appear is, however, no proof of the real state of the matter; for if—which much resembles the case in question, and has often occurred in the history of language—reduplicated forms undergo interior mutilation, by extrusion of the consonant of the second syllable, the first syllable then acquires the appearance of belonging to the root itself. No one misses, from the point of sight of our current language, from preterites like hietl the initial consonant of the root: every one holds the ʰ of hietl as identical with that of halte; and yet, as Grimm, with much acuteness, was the first to discover (I. 103. 104.), the syllable ʰi of hietl has gained this place by reduplication. The Old High German form is hialt hi(ʰ)alt, and the Gothic haihald, whose second, and thus radical ʰ, has escaped from the younger dialects. I now hold, contrary to my earlier opinion, the initial consonants of Sanskrit forms like tāpima, “we expiated,” for reduplicative, and I assume an extrusion of the base letter ʰ of tatapima, producing

* Compare §. 470 thā-s, tā-t, μā-ν
tāpima = taapima, and hence, by weakening the ṛ (=a + a) to ṛ (=a + i), tāpima. In the Slavonic damy, "I give," also, and in the Lithuanian dūmī, the first syllable has arisen by reduplication, and the radical syllable has entirely vanished. More of this hereafter.

474. Let us now turn to those middle terminations in ṛ, to which, in Greek, no α corresponds, and we believe that we recognise in the plural dhvē a pronominal nominative form in the sense of §. 228.; thus dhvē out of dhwa-i, from the base dhwa for twa. The dual terminations ṛtē, ṛtē, correspond, on the other hand, with neutral dual forms; such, for [G. Ed. p. 683.] instance, as ṛtē, "these two." In the secondary forms, dhwam, distributed into dhu-am, may, in regard of its termination, be compared with yū-y-am, "you," vay-am, "we;" but the dual expressions ṛtām, ṛtām, are related, with respect to their terminations, to dhwam, as, according to §. 206., ṛu (out of ṛs) is to as, and answer to dvām, "we two," yuvām, "ye two." For the rest, भाषे ṛ-thē, भाजे ṛtē, एताम् ṛtām, एताम् ṛtām, appear to me mutilations of ṛāthē, &c. (see Kuhn, l. c., p. 31); just as we have found above in the Vēda-dialect, in the third person singular imperative ṛm for ṛām (p. 681 G. ed.). The syllables (ṛ)ḥā, (ṛ)ā, which express the pronoun standing in the objective case-relation, are represented in Greek by the σ in δίσο-σ-θον, δίσο-σ-θην, ἐδίσο-σ-θον, ἐδίσο-σ-θην, which σ, according to §. 99., explains itself very satisfactorily as out of τ: the following θ, however, has likewise proceeded from τ through the influence of this σ; θ with a preceding aspirate, or σ, being a very favourite union. If we contrast δίσο-σ-θον, &c., with the Sanskrit dad'-ṭhā-thē, we perceive that the two languages, in dealing with the aboriginal form, so divide themselves, that the one has preserved only the consonant, the other only the vowel, of the pronominal expression standing in the oblique case-relation. In the second person plural the Sanskrit has dropped the vowel as well as the consonantal-element of the inter-
mediary pronoun; but I believe that dhwe, dhwam, in the condition of the language immediately anterior, were d-dhwe, d-dhwam; thus bhar-a-d-dhwe, abhar-a-d-dhwam = φερ-e-σ-θε ἐσφερ-e-σ-θε; for T sounds are easily suppressed before tw and dhw: hence we find in the gerund for dat-twã, "after giving," bhit-twã, "after cleaving," more commonly da-twã, bhit-twã; and in the second aorist form the second person plural of the middle exhibits both id-dhwam [G. Ed. p. 684.] (out of is-dhwam) and i-dhwam: finally, before the termination dhi of the second person imperative singular, a radical s is converted into d: this d may, however, also be suppressed; hence sā-dhi, as well as sād-dhi, "reign thou," for sās-dhi. The root as, "to be," forms merely ἑ-dhi* for ad-dhi, out of as-dhi. As, then, this ἑ-dhi is related to the Greek ἵσ-θι, so is bharadhwe for bharaddhwê to φερέσθε, only that in the latter place the Greek θ represents, not the Sanskrit dh (§. 16.), but the Greek τ, through the influence of the preceding σ. Hence arises, in the imperative also, φερέσθω, as a middle after-growth. For after φερέτω, a middle itself by origin (p. 678 G. ed.), had been applied in practice with a purely active signification, the necessity arose of forming from it a new medio-passive on the old principle. Even the infinitives in σθατί appear to me, by a misdirected feeling, to have proceeded out of this principle; for after the true signification of the σ under discussion was extinguished, the spirit of the language found it adapted, everywhere by its insertion before a τ, and the conversion of the latter into θ, to call forth a medio-passive signification. If, however, we disrobe the form διδοσθαμ of its σ, and bring back the θ to τ, we arrive at διδοστάμ, which admits of comparison with the Slavonic-Lithuanian infinitive in ti, just as this last has itself been traced back elsewhere to abstract substantives in

* As I think, immediately from ἑ-dhi, with a weakening of the ἑ to ἑ.
† But see § 888. p. 1202 G. ed.
Sanskrit with a similar termination in ti. The Vêda-dialect also supplies us with infinitives in ध्यदि, as dative feminine abstracts in धि, in which I can only recognise a transposition of the ordinary suffix ति (Gram. Crit. §. 640. Obs. 3.).

[G. Ed. p. 685.] 475. If we cast a glance back over the attempts we have made to explain the origin of the terminations of the middle voice, the theory, that they depend on the doubling of each personal designation as it occurs, will be found to rest principally on the fact, that, in the Greek ἐφερόμην, the Sanskrit abharatás, and Vedic bharadāti, one and the same personal expression is manifestly doubled, as also on the principle that it is most natural so to express ideas like "I give to me," "I rejoice me," that the "I," as well as the "to me," or "me"—the subjective as well as the objective case-relation—should find a formal representative in one and the same pronominal base. Apart, however, from ἐφερόμην, forms like φέρεσθε, and the to-be-supposed Sanskrit bharaddhwē for the existing bharadhwē, would admit yet another exposition, namely, that the Greek σ does not stand euphonically for τ, but on its own account, and as the base-consonant of the reflexive (§. 341.); which, although belonging to the third person, yet willingly undertakes the functions of both the others. In Sanskrit, the s of the reflexive base before the personal terminations dhwē and dhwam, by the universal laws of sound, would either become d, or be dropped; and so far in this way, also, the Greek φέρεσθε, ἐφέρεσθε, would go along with a Sanskrit bhar(d)hwē, abhara(d)hwam: for the above presupposed forms, such as bharathāthē, answering to φέρεσθον, we should have to assume bharasāthē, out of bharaswīthē. Were this assumption well founded, as probably a similar principle would have prevailed in all the productions of the middle voice, the terminations (m)ή, τέ, μαί, ταί, would have to be explained, not as from mami, tati, but from masi, tasi, or maswi.

* Influence of Pronouns on the Formation of Words.
taswi. The second person would remain sasi, but the second s would pertain, not to the second person, but to the reflexive, and we should then refer, also, the s of abharathâs to the reflexive, and necessarily suffer the μην of [G. Ed. p. 686.] ἐφερόμην to stand totally isolated, without sympathy with an old principle.

476. With respect to the Latin, it was in the “Annals of Oriental Literature” (London, 1820, p. 62), that it was first observed that the passive ṟ might owe its origin to the reflexive. I am now the more decided in giving a preference to this hypothesis over that which resorts to the verb substantive, as I have since recognised in the Lithuanian and Sclavonic, which I had not then drawn within the circle of my inquiries into comparative language, a similar, and, in truth, universally-recognised procedure; not, however, necessarily that aboriginal one which, in the remotest era of the formation of the language, must have governed those middle forms which are common to the Greek and Asiatic sisterhood; but I rather assume a gradual inroad of the reflexive of the third person into the second and first, as a substitute for some older and more decided expression of each person, on whom the action works retro-actively. The Old Sclavonic appends the accusative of the reflexive to the transitive verb, in order to give it a reflexive or passive signification; for instance, χτε chtâ, “lego,” becomes chtâsyâ, “legor”; and thus in the second and third person χτεσινά chteshisya, χτεσιά chetysya, plural χτεσια chtemsya, &c. (Dobrowsky, p. 544, Kopitar’s Glag. p. 64, xvii.) In the Bohemian, se is not so much as graphically connected with the verb, and may stand as well before as after it, but is used by preference for the expression of the passive only in the third person (Dobr. Böhm. Lehrg. p. 182), which may also be the case with the Old Sclavonic. In the Lithuanian such verbal expressions have merely a reflexive signification,
VERBS.

[Ed. p. 687.] but bear more the appearance of a grammatical unity, and therefore more resemble the Latin passive, because it is not a positive case of the reflexive pronoun, whose accusative is *sawen* (p. 477),* but only its initial consonant, which is appended to the verb, either immediately, or with an *e* prefixed. The latter occurs in the persons which end in *i* or *e*, the latter of which, before the appended *es*, becomes *i*. Compare, in this respect, the Old Latin *amari*-er from *amare*-er, with forms like *wadinnati*-es, “ye name you,” for *wadinnate*-es. The dual terminations *wa* and *ta* convert their *a* into *o*, and a simple *u* of the first person becomes *û*. I annex here the present of *wadinnûs*, “I name myself;”† opposite the simple transitive.

**SINGULAR.**

1. wadinnu, wadinnûs.
2. wadinni, wadinnies.
3. wadinna, wadinnas.

**DUAL.**

1. wadinnawa, wadinnawos.
2. wadinnata, wadinnatos.
3. like sing. like sing.

**PLURAL.**

2. wadinnate, wadinnaties.
3. like sing. like sing.

* It would appear, that, together with this *sawen*, or, in the dative, together with *saw*, a kindred form *si* co-existed, as, in Old Slavonic, *si* with *sebye*, and from this *si* it is plain that the suffix of the verba reflexiva proceeded; and in the third person, instead of a simple *s* the full *si* may stand; for instance, *wadinnas* or *wadinna*, “he names himself.” With verbs, also, beginning with *at, ap*, and some other prepositions, or the negation *ne*, the reflexive is interposed in the shape of *sï*, but may also be appended to the end; for instance, *issilaika* (*is*-si-*laika*-s), “I sustain me.”

† Compare Sanskrit *vad*, “to speak.”
477. To these formations the Latin passive is strikingly similar, only that here the composition is already obscured, as the sense of independence of the reflexive pronoun is not here maintained by its mobility, as in the Lithuanian, where, under the above-cited conditions, it is placed before the verb. By the favourite interchange, also, between s and r, a scission has occurred between the passive suffix and the simple reflexive. In the persons ending with consonants, a connecting vowel was necessary towards the adjunction of the r, and u stands as such in amatur, amantur, as it seems to me through the influence of the liquids. The imperative-forms amato-r and amanto-r required no auxiliary vowel. In amamur the s of amamus has given way before the reflexive, which is not surprising, as the s does not belong to the personal designation, and, in Sanskrit, is given up also in the simple verb, in the secondary forms, and occasionally even in the primary. In amer, on the other hand, the personal character is itself sacrificed to the suffix, for amemr was not possible, and amemur was forestalled for the plural (instead of amemusr). In amaris, ameris, &c., there is either a transposition of amasir, or the personal character s has been unable to withstand the inclination to become r when placed between two vowels (§. 22.); and the reflexive has protected its original s, (just as the comparative suffix in the neuter exhibits ius opposed to ior (§. 298.)) and hence i here forms the conjunctive vowel of the s, not u, which is used to conjoin r.* In the singular imperative-person ama-re, [G. Ed. p. 689.]

* That the i of amaris belongs to the original termination si, as Pott conjectures (Etym. Forsch. p. 135), I cannot admit, because I hold this kind of passive formation far younger than the period when the i of the active expression in Latin was still extant, as it has also vanished in Greek without a trace, except in ieroi. In the secondary forms, however, it had disappeared before the individualization of the languages here compared, and yet we find amabaris, ameris.
the reflexive, in advantageous contrast with the other passive forms, has protected its vowel; and if we commute this re into se, we obtain the perfect accusative of the simple pronoun. We have already attended to the old infinitive form amari-er, produced by transposition for amare-re (p. 662). If we prefer, however, which I do not, to exempt the imperative amare from the universal principle of the Latin passive, we might recognise in it a remnant of the Hellenic-Sanskrit and Zend structure, and compare re as a personal termination to σο, ὰ swa, ὰ ha, of which more hereafter.

478. That the second person plural amamini steps out of all analogy with the other passive persons is easy to observe, and nothing but the circumstance, that the earlier procedure of grammar did not trouble itself at all with the foundation of lingual phenomena, and that the relationship between the Greek and Latin was not systematically and scientifically traced out, can account for the fact, that the form amamini had so long found its place in the paradigms, without raising the question how and whence it came there. I believe I was the first to bring this under discussion in my Conjugation System (Frankf. a. M. 1816. p. 105, ff.); and I repeat with confidence the explanation there given, namely, that amamini is a passive participle in the masculine nominal plural; thus amamini for amamini estis, as, in Greek, τετυμένου εἰσί. The Latin suffix is minu-s, and corresponds to the Greek μενος and Sanskrit mān-as. From the fact, however, that these participles in Latin are thrust aside in ordinary practice, mini has, in the second person plural—where it has continued as if petrified, as far as the practice of the language is concerned—assumed the character of a verbal termination, and has thus also, having lost the consciousness of its nominal nature, renounced its distinction of gender, and its appendage estis. If we found amaminae for the feminine
and *amamina* for the neuter, we should be spared the trouble of seeking an explanation for *amamini*, inasmuch as it would partly be afforded by the language itself. It may be suitable here to bring to remembrance a similar procedure in Sanskrit: this employs *dātā* (from the base *dātār*, § 144.), properly *daturus*, in the sense of *daturus est*, without reference to gender, and, therefore, also for *datura* and *datum est*, although this form of word, which is also a representative of the Latin nomen agentis in *tor*, has a feminine in *trī* at its command (see *trī-c*, § 119.), and the giveress is no more called *dātā* than the giver in Latin *dator*. In the plural, also, *dātāras*, used as a substantive, stands for "the givers," and in the character of a verbal person, "they will give;" this in all genders; likewise in the dual, *dātārāu*. The procedure of the Sanskrit is thus still more remarkable than that of the Latin, because its *dātā*, *dātāru*, *dātārās*, has maintained itself in the ordinary nominal usage of the language. It is therefore due merely to the circumstance, that the language, in its condition as handed down to us, could no longer deal *ad libitum* with the forms in the sense of future participles, that *dātā*, *dātāru*, *dātārās*, where they signify *dabit*, *dabunt*, have lost all consciousness of their adjectival nature, and their capacity for distinction of gender, [G. Ed. p. 691.] and have assumed altogether the character of ordinary personal terminations. To return, however, to the Latin *amamini*: the Reviewer of my Conjugation System, in the "Jena Literaturzeitung" (if I mistake not, Grotefend), supports the explanation given by the forms *alumnus*, *vertumnus*, which evidently belong to these participial formations, but have lost the *i*. This, however, has been preserved in *terminus*, if, as Lisch, and beyond dispute correctly, lays down, we consider it as expressing "that which is overstepped," and identify its root with the Sanskrit *tar* (*trī*).*

* Vocalismus, p. 174.
(as giving birth, and therefore middle), which is likewise instanced by Lisch, I had before recognised as a formation belonging to the same category: the root is *fē*, from which also *fetus, fetura, and fecundus*. *Gemini*, moreover, as “the born together,” (from the root *gen*) may be considered as an abbreviation of *genmini* or *genimini*.

479. How stands the case now with the imperative *amaminor*? Are we to consider its *r* as identical with that of *amor, amator, amantor*? I think not; for it was not necessary to express here the passive or reflexive meaning by an appended pronoun, as the medio-passive participial suffix was fully sufficient for this purpose. Our best course, then, is to seek in *amaminor* for a plural case-termination as in *amamini*; and this is afforded us, as I have observed in my Conjugation System (p. 106), by the Eugubian Tables, where, for instance, we find *subutor* for the Latin *subacti, screhitor* for *scripti.*† The singulars, however, of the second masculine declension in the Umbrian end in *o*: we

[G. Ed. p. 692.] find *orto* for *ortus, suboto* for *subactus*. Now it is remarkable that, in accordance with these singular forms in *o*, there are extant also, in Latin, singular imperatives in *mino*, namely, *famino* in Festus, and *pra-famino* in Cato de R. R. To these forms, before described, we can add *fruimino*, which Struve (Lat. Decl. and Conj. p. 143) cites from an inscription in Gruter, “*is eum agrum nei habeto nei fruimino*,” where the form in question plainly belongs to the third person, by which it still more conclusively proclaims itself to be a participle, in which character it may with equal right be applied to one as to the other person.

“Remark.—Gräfe, in his work, ‘The Sanskrit verb compared with the Greek and Latin from the point of

The termination *or* accords perfectly with the Sanskrit *ds* (*a+s*) and Gothic *ds* (§. 227.); while the Latin *i* has obtruded itself from the pronominal declension (§. 228.).
view of Classical Philology,' remarks, p. 120, that he once considered, as I do, the form in mini as a participle similar in kind to the Greek in μενος, but now considers it, with confidence, as a remnant of an old analogy of the Greek infinitive in εμεναι, which, having been originally passive, had first been applied to the imperative in Latin, and thence had been further diffused. How near the imperative and infinitive come together, and how their forms are interchanged, Gräfe thinks he has shewn, l. c. p. 58 ff., where, namely, the Greek second person in οὐ (τούς) is deduced from the Sanskrit first person singular in ǝdni; but where the remark follows, that in any case, tiṣṭhāni (‘let me stand’) is manifestly and strikingly like the infinitive iṣṭāvau, and much more, if we consider that ai in Sanskrit is merely the diphthong nearest to i (in Greek, however, the rarest, see Vocalism. p. 193). We have, however, to remember, that, in iṣṭāvau, the α belongs to the root, and that, therefore, for a parallel with the Sanskrit imperative, if such be admitted, only vai can be compared to ǝdni. Gräfe goes on: ‘It would be easy to imagine that the first person plural तिष्ठाम tīṣṭhāma had its counterpart in the other infinitive form iṣṭāmu, properly iṣṭāme,* i.e. stare. Finally, it may not be left unobserved, that the Greek [G. Ed. p. 693.] and Sanskrit imperative in θθ, dhi, is again the form of the infinitive in the Slavonic dialects,† and that custom admits the frequent use of the infinitive for the imperative in Greek.’ I could hardly have expected that the personal terminations of the Sanskrit imperative could lead to so many and various comparisons. It appears, however, to me ill suited to the spirit of classical philology, without necessity to attribute to the Greek that it has borrowed inter alia its

* I consider the v very essential, just because I deduce μεν and μεναι from the middle participial suffix μενος.

† I explain their ti as identical with the abstract substantive suffix रि ti.
second person imperative in \textit{ov} from any Sanskrit first person. I find it still less congenial to the spirit of a more universal comparative philology, that Grafe, who has before overlooked many laws of sound incontrovertibly established, should, in his comparisons, lend too willing an ear to mere similitudes of sound; for instance, where (p. 39.) he explains the root चर \textit{char}, 'to go,' by the periphrasis ('\textit{hinscharren}'), 'to move scraping along on the ground,' and where (p. 32, Note) he compares लप \textit{lap}, 'to speak,' with \textit{lappen}, 'to botch,' 'to speak imperfectly,' and \textit{λάππω}. I was not aware that a German \textit{sch} anywhere corresponded to a Sanskrit \textit{ch}, but I knew that it did so to \textit{f} (or \textit{v}), in observance of the law of permutation of sounds (§. 87.), and of the favourite practice of exchange between gutturals and labials. Remark but the relation of \textit{chatu\ddot{r}as} to the Gothic \textit{fal\ddot{r}} and German \textit{vier}, as also that of \textit{panCh\ddot{a}n} to \textit{f\ddot{u}nF}, and the identification of the Sanskrit \textit{char}, 'go,' and Gothic \textit{farya} (preterite \textit{f\ddot{a}r}), 'to go,' 'to wander,' German \textit{fahren}, will be satisfactorily proved. If, however, we are to admit that any infinitive has arisen out of any imperative person, it would be the least far-fetched supposition, which derived the Sanskrit infinitive and the Latin supine in \textit{tum} from the third person imperative \textit{तु} \textit{tu}, by the addition of \textit{m}; for instance, \textit{bh\ddot{a}tum}, 'to shine,' from \textit{bh\ddot{a}tu}, 'let him shine'; \textit{p\ddot{a}tum}, 'to rule,' from \textit{p\ddot{a}tu}, 'let him rule.' In \textit{kartum}, 'to make,' from \textit{karo\ddot{t}u}, 'let him make,' the class vowel only would be thrust aside. As, however, Grafe (l. c. p. 58) has found a jest in what I have elsewhere said, and mean to repeat, of the first person imperative, I must take care that he does not take for earnest what I mean as a jest. We do not, in truth, go so far in deriving \textit{bh\ddot{a}tum} from \textit{bh\ddot{a}tu} as in deducing \textit{ist\ddot{a}v\ddot{a}j} from \textit{तिष्ठाति ti\ddot{s}h\ddot{th}ā\ddot{n}i} (Zend \textit{hist\ddot{a}nī}), 'let me stand'; but I can find no other relationship between \textit{bh\ddot{a}-tu} and \textit{bh\ddot{a}-tum} than this, that in the infinitive, as an abstract substantive, the action is personified through a form which comes near the expression of
the third person in the imperative. I recog-

nise in the suffix *tu*, as also in that of *ti*, (of another class of abstracts, with which the Sclavonic and Lithuanian infinitive is connected), different gradations of one and the same pronoun of the third person—as in the interrogative we find the forms *ka*, *ki*, *ku*,—and so far a relationship between the nominal classes in question and the terminations *ti* and *tu* of *bhāti*, ‘he shines,’ and *bhātu*, ‘let him shine.’ The coincidence is thus in any case not quite so fortuitous as that between *iṣṭā-vai* and *tiṣṭhāni*, ‘let me stand.’ Whosoever derives the former from the latter cannot escape from bringing into this family the Gothic infinitives in *an*, especially as the *a* of *stand-an* does not, like that of *iṣṭā-vai*, belong to the root. Historically, however, as I doubt not, the German infinitive belongs to the class of the Sanskrit abstracts in *ana*, as *bandh-ana*, ‘the binding’ = Gothic *bind-an*.

INFLUENCE OF THE WEIGHT OF THE PERSONAL TERMINATIONS.

480. The weight of the personal terminations exercises, in Sanskrit and Greek, and, as far as we have evidence, also in Zend, an influence on the antecedent radical or class syllable, obvious and comprehensive, though till lately quite overlooked.* Before light terminations extensions are frequent, which, before the heavier, are withdrawn; so that in many anomalous verbs the entire body of the root can only be maintained before the light terminations, but, before the heavy, mutilation occurs. For instance, the root अस as, “to be,” retains its *a* only before the light terminations, but rejects it before the heavy, as if it had been overgrown by the augment; hence, indeed, *asmī*, “I am,” but *smas*, “we are”; *stha*, “ye are,” *santi*, “they are.” [G. Ed. p. 695.]

* I was first led to the observation of this interesting phenomenon in my investigation into the origin of the German Ablaut (Berlin Jahrb. Feb. 1827, p. 259, and Vocalismus, p. 13.)
We see, however, that this mutilation had not yet established itself at the period of the unity of the language; for the Greek protects, in the verb substantive, the radical vowel corrupted to ε, even before the heavier terminations, and opposes ἐσμες, ἐστε, ἐστόν, ἐστόν, to the Sanskrit smas, stha, sthas, stas. The Lithuanian and Sclavonic, also, testify to the comparatively recent loss of the Sanskrit a before the weightier terminations. Compare

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SANSKRIT.</th>
<th>GREEK.</th>
<th>LITH.</th>
<th>SCLAVONIC.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>चस्ति as-mi,</td>
<td>ἐμ-μί*,</td>
<td>es-mi,</td>
<td>केम्ब ये-म्य.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>चस्ति as-i,†</td>
<td>ἐσ-σί,</td>
<td>es-si,</td>
<td>केसी ये-सः.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>चस्ति as-ti,</td>
<td>ἐσ-τί,</td>
<td>es-ti,</td>
<td>केट्त्य ये-त्य.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>सर्स s-was,</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>es-wl,</td>
<td>केबा ये-वः.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>सर्स s-thas,</td>
<td>ἐσ-τόν,</td>
<td>es-ta,</td>
<td>केटा ये-टः.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>सर्स s-tus,</td>
<td>ἐσ-τόν,</td>
<td>like the Sing.</td>
<td>केटा ये-तु.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DUAL.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>सर्स s-mas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>सर्स s-tha,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>सर्स s-anti,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLURAL.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| “Remark.—It is possible that the suppression of the radical vowel may have begun with the third person plural, whose termination anti is also the heaviest of all, and it may have existed in this position even before the migration of language, and its manifold individualizations; at least, all [G. Ed. p.696.] the languages under comparison exhibit in this case a wonderful harmony scarcely attributable to chance: and, in addition to these, the Latin sunt, as opposed

* By assimilation out of ἐσ-μί. as, before, ἀμμες, ὄμμες, out of ὄμμες, ἀμμες, Vedic asmē, yūghmē.
† Irregular for as-si, on which are based the Greek and Lithuanian forms. The Sclavonic, however, has likewise dropped one of the two sibilants.
to *es-tis*, as well as the Gothic *sind*, are in accordance. On the other hand, the dropping of the *e* in *sumus* first appeared on Roman ground, and, in the singular likewise, *sum* for *esum* is quite isolated. After the falling away of the initial and terminating vowels of *asmi* in the Latin, the insertion of an auxiliary vowel became necessary, and the influence of the liquids prevailed in favour of *u*. This *u* remained, also, in the plural, where *s-mus* was possible, but not favoured, as the Latin has generally gone out of its way to avoid the immediate connection of the ending *mus* with roots terminating in consonants; whence we have *vol-u-mus* opposed to *vul-tis*, *vul-t*; *fer-i-mus* to *fer-tis*, *fer-s*, *fer-t* (Sanskrit *bibhri-mas*, *bibhri-tha*, *bi-bhar-shi*, *bibhar-ti* from *bhri* class 3); *ed-i-mus* opposed to *es-tis*, *ē-s*, *es-t* (Sanskrit *ad-mas*, *at-tha*, *at-si*, *at-ti*). To the Greek, in the case of the third person plural, *ēvrī*, if, as I scarcely doubt, it stands for *σ-evrī* (=Zend *h-entī*), nothing has remained but the termination, as in the Sanskrit, in the second person middle, *sē* for *α(σ)-sē*. The Gothic we have excluded from the above comparison, although *i-m*, *i-s*, *is-t*, are based upon *as-mi*, *a-si*, *as-ti*; but, in the plural numbers, *sind* alone is organic, for *siy-u-m*, *siy-u-th* Dual *siy-ā* (see §. 441.), *siy-u-ts*, have the terminations of the preterite, and belong to a secondary root *siy*, which proceeds from the Sanskrit potential *syām*, in which *sy* has changed itself to *siy*.

481. All Sanskrit roots of the third class in *ā* (§. 109*. 3.) depend, on account of the anterior burthen created in the reduplication syllable, on the influence of the weight of the personal terminations, so that they retain their *ā* only before the light, but before the heavier either altogether suppress or shorten it, or change the length of the *a*-sound into that of the lighter *i*; and this is one of the evidences from which I deduce the maxim—very important for the history of language—that the organism of the lingual body sustains a greater weight in the *a* than in the *i*
sounds, the long á being heavier than the long ē, and the short a heavier than the short ē (see Vocalismus, Obser. 12. p. 214).

[G. Ed. p. 697.] The roots dâ, “to give,” and dhâ, “to place,” suppress their ā before heavy terminations, with exception of the third person plural, if, as I prefer, we make the division dada-ti, not dad-ati (compare §. 458.); for the original form was certainly dadá-nti, whence never could come dad-nti, but dada-nti well enough, and, out of this, with a new sacrifice to the reduplication syllable, dada-ti. The Greek only shortens the long vowel before the increasing terminations, and makes διδο, τίθε, ἵστα, out of διδω, τίθη, ἵστα. In the Latin, Slavonic, and Lithuanian, the influence of the weight of the personal endings on the antecedent syllable has utterly vanished, and dâ has also lost the original length of its vowel and the reduplication syllable. The Lithuanian and Slavonic have, on the other hand, saved their reduplication, but have absolutely suppressed the root-vowel, which the Sanskrit only does before heavy terminations. As, however, the ā also vanishes before endings which commence with m and s—in Lithuanian also with w—but before t passes into s (§. 457.), the reduplication in these verbs is almost totally overlooked, and in dümi, damy, which are mutilations of dü-d'-mi, da-d'-my, the reduplication has, by thrusting out the most essential element of the entire form, acquired the appearance of a radical syllable. It is, however, certain, that in dümi, damy, the syllables dü, da, are identical with those of dü-s-ti, da-s-ty, for dü-d-ti, da-d-ty, thus merely reduplicators.* Compare—

* We here confirm the observations of §. 442., Note 7. In düdu, according to the usual conjugation, düd has constituted itself as root, and the a of düd-a-wa, düd-a-me, has thus nothing more to do with the d of the Sanskrit dadámi, or the ō, o, of the Greek διδωμ, διδομεν, but belongs to a class with the a of wez-a-wà, wez-a-mè.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SANSKRIT.</th>
<th>ZEND.</th>
<th>GREEK.</th>
<th>LITH.</th>
<th>OLD SCLAV.</th>
<th>LATIN.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>dadā-mi,</td>
<td>dadhā-mi,</td>
<td>ḍīdō-μ,</td>
<td>ḍū(d)-mi,</td>
<td>da(d)-my,</td>
<td>do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dadā-si,</td>
<td>dadhā-hi,</td>
<td>ḍīdō-ς,</td>
<td>ḍā(d)-i,</td>
<td>da(d)-si,</td>
<td>da-s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dadā-ti,</td>
<td>dadhāi-ti,</td>
<td>ḍīdō-τι,</td>
<td>ḍūs-τι,</td>
<td>das-τυ,</td>
<td>dat.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DUAL.**

dad-was, .... .... d²(d)-wa, dad-e-va ....
dat-thas, daś-tō?¹ ḍīdō-τον, ḍūs-τα, das-ta ....
dat-tas, daś-tō?² ḍīdō-τον, like Sing. das-ta ....

**PLURAL.**
dad-mas, dad-ē-mahi, ḍīdō-μες, ḍū(d)-me, da(d)-my, da-mus.
dudā-ti, dadē-nti, ḍīdō-ντι, like Sing. dad-γατυ, da-nt.

In the Greek the influence of the weight of the personal terminations over the radical syllable has penetrated further than in Sanskrit, in this respect, that even the aorist forms, set free from reduplication, ἐθν and ἐδων, have shortened their vowel before the increasing terminations, while ἐστην (ἐσταν), in accordance with similar Sanskrit aorist-forms, allows no influence to the weight of the endings. In Sanskrit, from the first augmented preterite adadā-m comes the plural adad-ma, as, in Greek, ἔδιδο-μεν from ἔδιδω-ν; but from adām comes, not adma, but the root remains un- [G. Ed. p. 699.] diminished. It may be convenient to give here in full the two augmented preterites, which are distinguished in the two languages by retaining and laying aside the reduplication syllable.

---

¹ Although the second dual person in Zend is not yet identified, it may nevertheless be deduced with tolerable certainty from the third person in tō, which is extant (§. 464.), for which, in the second person of the primary forms, we may expect thō, the aspirate of which, however, has been forced to vanish in ḍūs-tō (see §. 453.). Upon ṣṣ for ḍ ṣ see §. 102. Conclusion. ² §. 102. Conclusion. ³ §. 30. ⁴ §. 102. Conclusion i, and §. 453. ⁵§. 150.
VERBS.

SINGULAR.  
adadd-m, eS/Sco-v,  
adadd-s,  
adadd-t,  
ad-m,  
ad-t,  
eJa>-,  
e&o-r,  
DUAL.  
adad-wa, ...  
ad-ma, eS/eS-

PLURAL.  
adad-ma, eS/eS-

482. The Sanskrit roots ḫā, "to leave,"† ḡā, "to go," and ma, "to measure" (compare μέ-τρον, μμέομαι, &c.)—the two last have only the middle, the first only the pure active form—weaken, before most of the heavy terminations, their a to i, and the two last substitute also, in their reduplication syllable, a short i for short a. For instance, jahē-mas, "we leave," opposed to jahā-mi, "I leave"; mimē (from mimē-mē), "I measure," mimē-mahē, "we measure." The roots ष्ठा sthā, "to stand," and ग्धा ghādā, "to smell," follow a peculiar path, inasmuch as a vowel-shortening, which probably at its origin, as in the Greek ἵσταμι, ἵσταμεν, only obtained before heavy terminations, has extended itself to the other persons through which the radical a, thus shortened, would be treated

[G. Ed. p. 700.] just like the unradical of the first and sixth class (109*. 1). Hence the Indian grammarians reckon these roots as under the first class, although they assume a reduplication syllable, which, however, substitutes an i for a, as I doubt not, on the ground that the reduplication syllable, which is seeking generally for relief from weight, and therefore, as a rule, converting long into short vowels, may not combine the heaviest among the short vowels, with the length derived from position; hence, ti.ḥhāmi, tīṣthāsāi.

* See §. 402
† Compare, with Pott, χῆ-pa, "widow," as the "abandoned" or "left."

In Sanskrit vi-dhavā is "the manless."
tishthati, &c., Zend histāmi, histasi, histati; jighrāmi, jighrasi; jighrati, &c. The Greek follows this principle of the weakening of the vowel, there also, where there is not, as in the cases of ἵστημι, κίχρημι, any immediate reason for it by the doubling of consonants. Πίμπλημι and πίμπρημι are, however, striking and peculiar in appending a nasal, a stranger to the root, to the reduplicated syllable. These forms, however, accord with the Sanskrit intensive verbs, which love a great emphasis in the repeated syllable, and hence change to the Guna letters the vowels susceptible of Guna, but double the whole root in roots ending with nasals, and, in some cases, also represent the liquids r and l by the nasal liquids which accord with the organ of the chief consonants of the root; for instance, jangam,* from gam, “to go”; chan- chal from chal, “to totter”; chanchur (for chanchar), from char, “to go.” In this sense, then, I take πίμπρημι, πίμπλημι, for πίρπρημι, πίλπλημι: thus, also, βαμβαίνω, with the kindred form βαμβάλω (compare balbus).

483. As the roots of the second class (§. 109*. 3.), in Sanskrit, do not load themselves with reduplication, so neither do they subject a concluding d to [G. Ed. p. 701.] the influence of the weight of the personal terminations. The Greek, however, has here also again permitted a wider range to that influence, inasmuch as φημι (φāμι), in this respect, follows the analogy of ἵστημι. Compare—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SINGULAR</th>
<th>DUAL</th>
<th>PLURAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>bhā-mi, φā-μί</td>
<td>bhā-vas, . . .</td>
<td>bhā-mas, φā-μές.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bhā-si, φή-ς</td>
<td>bhā-thas, φά-τόν</td>
<td>bhā-tha, φά-τέ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bhā-ti, φā-τί</td>
<td>bhā-tas, φά-τόν</td>
<td>bhā-ni, φά-ντί.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abhā-m, ἑφα-ν</td>
<td>abhā-va . . .</td>
<td>abhā-ma, ἑφα-μές.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abhā-s, ἑφα-ς</td>
<td>abhā-tam, ἑφα-τον</td>
<td>abhā-ta, ἑφα-τέ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abhā-t, ἑφα-τ</td>
<td>abhā-tam, ἑφα-την</td>
<td>abhā-ν, ἑφα-ν.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Compare with this the Gothic gagga (= ganga), “I go,” where the chief syllable has lost the nasal
This analogy is followed in Sanskrit, among other roots, by \( yd \), "to go," on which the Greek \( \tilde{h} \eta \mu \), properly "to make to go," rests, to which the syllable of reduplication has lent a causative signification, as to the Latin \( sisto \) opposed to \( sto \), while the Greek \( \dot{i}o\tau\eta\mu \) (=\( \sigmaio\tau\eta\mu \)) unites the primitive with the causative signification. While in \( \dot{i}o\tau\eta\mu \) the spiritus asper, as it so often does, stands for \( \sigma \), in \( \dot{i}\eta\mu \) it is the representative of the lost semi-vowel \( \varsigma \), as, among other words, in \( \dot{\delta} \varsigma \) for \( \dot{\mu} \varsigma \ yas \), "who" (§. 382.); thus \( \dot{i}\eta\mu \) for \( \upsilon\gamma\eta\mu \): on the other hand, compare the future \( \tilde{h}\sigma\omega \), relieved from the reduplication, with the Sanskrit \( yd-\dot{\varsigma}\dot{\pi} \dot{\omega} \). This \( \dot{i}\eta\mu \) still bends to the weight of the terminations; thus \( \dot{i}\epsilon\mu\epsilon \), \( \dot{i}-\tau\epsilon \), opposed to \( yd-\dot{m} \dot{\alpha} \), \( yd-\tau\dot{h} \dot{\alpha} \). To the root \( yd \), I think, with Pott (Etym. Forsch. p. 201), we must refer the middle of \( e\mu \), which itself belongs to the root \( \dot{\iota} \ i \), "to go," which in Greek, analogously to \( \dot{i}-\mu\epsilon \), should form \( \dot{i}\mu\alpha \), \( \dot{i}\sigma\alpha \), \( \dot{i}\tau\alpha \), answering to the Sanskrit \( i-\gamma \dot{\epsilon} \) (from \( i-\mu \theta \)), \( i-\gamma\theta \), \( i-\tau \theta \).

[G. Ed. p. 702.] The form \( \dot{i}\epsilon-\mu\alpha \), however, is to be derived from \( yd \), by a vocalization of the semi-vowel, and thinning of the \( \dot{d} \) to \( e \). In duly considering, then, what I think I have proved, that the personal terminations exercise a wider influence on the preceding syllable in Greek than in Sanskrit, and that, for example, roots ending in vowels shorten one originally long before heavy terminations, the verbs \( \dot{h}\mu\alpha \) and \( k\epsilon-\mu\alpha \) might surprise us, since in these the heavy middle terminations have not shortened the antecedent vowel. Of \( k\epsilon-\mu\alpha \) we shall treat hereafter; but \( \dot{h}-\mu\alpha \) owes the retention of the length of its vowel to the circumstance that its root was originally terminated by a consonant, and I have already, in my Glossary, identified it with the Sanskrit \( ds \), "to sit," the \( s \) of which has remained in the Greek only before \( \tau \); hence \( \dot{h}\gamma-\tau\alpha \) (=\( \chi\alpha\lambda\dot{e} \) \( ds-\tau \dot{e} \)), \( \dot{h}\gamma-\tau\dot{\omega} \) (=\( \chi\alpha\lambda \) \( ds-\tau \dot{\alpha} \)).* It accords, however, with the system of

* On the other hand, \( \epsilon-\sigma \alpha \), &c, belong to the root "\( \bar{E} \Delta \) (\( \dot{\tau} \bar{d}-\pi \alpha \)), Sanskrit \( \bar{u} \bar{d} \) (compare Pott, Etym. Forsch. p. 278, and Kühner, p. 242). The spiritus
equilibrium that καθημαυ cannot bear the σ of ἴσ-το, together with the burthen of the augment; hence, indeed, καθησ-το; but εκαθη-το.

484. The Sanskrit root शास सद्स, "to rule," exhibits a peculiar susceptibility for the weight of the personal terminations, inasmuch as its long ḍ remains undisturbed before those heavy terminations which begin with the weakest consonants (semi-vowels and nasals); thus सद्स-वास, "we two rule," सद्स-मस, "we rule," but, before the stronger consonants of heavy terminations, weakens itself to the shortness of the lightest vowel, namely, to i, whence, for instance, siṣṭha, "regitis," opposed to सद्स-सि, "regis," सद्स-ति, "regit." We may recognise in this a forerunner of [G. Ed. p. 703.] the German conjugation-forms, such as binda, bindam, bundum, opposed to the monosyllabic singular preterite band, bans-t, p. 116 G. ed.

485. The roots of the ninth class (§. 109°. 5.) are so far in accordance with the principle of the roots ḷa and ṛa, mentioned in §. 482., in that they weaken to i the ḍ of the class syllable ṛa, in the same places in which those roots experience the same relief in their radical syllable. The Greek, on the other hand, shortens the long Doric a (η) to ā. Compare—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SINGULAR</th>
<th>DUAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>krī-ṇā-mī, 1</td>
<td>πέρ-νᾶ-μι.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>krī-ṇā-si</td>
<td>πέρ-νᾶ-ς.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>krī-ṇā-ti</td>
<td>πέρ-νᾶ-τι.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>akrī-ṇā-m</td>
<td>ἐπέρ-νᾶ-ν.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>akrī-ṇā-s</td>
<td>ἐπέρ-νᾶ-ς.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>akrī-ṇā-t</td>
<td>ἐπέρ-νᾶ-τ.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

spiritus of ṛμα is inorganic, i.e. not from σ; as, for instance, in ṛδωρ opposed to Ṛद ṛδα, unda.
VERBS.

PLURAL.

krī-nī-maś, πέρ-νά-μες.
kri-nī-tha, πέρ-νά-τε.
kri-nā-nī, (πέρ-νά-ντι)

'akri-nī-ma, ἐπέρ-νά-μες.
akri-nī-ta, ἐπέρ-νά-τε.
akri-nā-nī, (ἐπέρ-νά-ντι)

1 krīnāmi, "I purchase," has n for n in the middle syllable through the euphonic influence of the antecedent r. The relationship to the Greek πέρπνμι rests on the favourite exchange between gutturals and labials, through which the Greek verb has assumed an apparent relationship to περπω, "to sail through" (=Sanskrit pārayāmi), where the τ is primitive. 2 If we make the division krī-nī-anti, akri-nī-an (§. 458.), we must assume that the middle syllable suppresses its vowel before all those heavy terminations which themselves begin with a vowel; thus, also, in the middle, krī-nī-e from krī-nī-mē. For the special purposes of Sanskrit Grammar this rule may hold good; but in considering the historical development or decay of the language, I am more inclined to the belief that the syllable nā has shortened itself before nti and n (older nt) instead of converting itself into the long form of the lighter i sound, in order to avoid combining length of vowel and position. The middle dual-terminations āthē, ātē, āthām, atām, did not require the weakening of the nā to ni, since without this, by the ordinary rule of sound, two homogeneous vowels melt into one long one; so that nā+āthē gives a lighter form than ni+āthē, which latter would give ny-ātē, while from nā+ātē comes merely nātē.

486. With Sanskrit verbs of the second and third class, with a radical vowel capable of Guna,* the influence of the weight of the personal terminations is shewn in this, that Guna takes place before the light (§. 26.), but before the heavy the pure radical vowel reappears. The same law

* The Sanskrit conjugation-system only allows the Guna to short vowels before simple consonants, and to long at the end of roots. On the other hand, Guna never takes place in the middle of the roots, where there is length by nature and position.
is respected by the Greek, which, however, affords no example, except that of εἰμι (§. 26.), of a verb with a radical vowel capable of Guna, which, in the special tenses (§. 109*), connects the personal sign directly with the root. Compare—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SINGULAR</th>
<th>DUAL</th>
<th>PLURAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ε-μι, ει-μι.</td>
<td>i-νας, . . .</td>
<td>i-μας, i-μες.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ε-σί, ει-ς.</td>
<td>i-θύσ, i-τον,</td>
<td>i-θά, i-τε.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ε-τι, ει-τι.</td>
<td>i-λας, i-τον,</td>
<td>y-αντι, i-ασι (from i-αντι).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

That the middle ἰεμαί belongs to another [G. Ed. p. 703.] root has been already remarked (p. 676).

487. An exception to the law of gravity is found in the root ἵ, class 2 ("to lie," "to sleep," ) in that, although only used in the middle, despite the weight of the middle terminations, it everywhere exhibits Guna; in which respect the Greek κειμαί runs exactly parallel to the Sanskrit: hence κει-σαί=σέ-σι, κει-ταί=σέ-τε, plural κει-μεθα=σέ-μαθε. We might also present σῆ, as the root for the Sanskrit verb, as the pure vowel ἴ nowhere appears, and the formation, also, of the word exhibits no expression, which would make a root ἵ necessary, rather than σῆ, unless, perhaps, we should take σίτα, "cold," in the sense of "frozen," and therefore "resting," "motionless," and hence choose to derive it from σῆ. The Old Sclavonic exhibits the old diphthong in the shape presented by the Greek κοίτη, κοιμάω, in ποκόi pokoi, "requies," "pax."* On the other hand, θινο chiyâ, "quiescit," has undergone a double weakening; first, that of κ to χ, and next, the thinning out of the diphthong to its concluding element. It must not be overlooked that pokoi is not the primitive shape of the base, but po-koyo, out of which, in the uninflected nominative and accusative, after suppression of the final vowel of the base (§. 257.), po-koi necessarily came:

* Kopitar's Glagolita, p. 86.
the theme *pokoyo*, however, accords excellently with the Sanskrit *suya*; as adjective, “lying,” “sleeping;” as substantive, “sleep.”

488. The roots of the fifth and eighth class admit the Guna form of the ग u of the class syllable un or u before the light terminations, and, before the heavy, reject the Guna-vowel: the Greek obeys the same principle, only, instead of extending v into eu, it lengthens the u. Compare—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SINGULAR</th>
<th>DUAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>stri-ṇo-mi,*</td>
<td>στόρ-νῦ-μ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stri-ṇo-ṣhi,</td>
<td>στόρ-νῦ-ς.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stri-ṇo-ti,</td>
<td>στόρ-νῦ-τι.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>astri-ṇaḥ-am,</td>
<td>ἑστόρ-νῦ-ν.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>astri-ṇaḥ-s,</td>
<td>ἑστόρ-νῦ-ς.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>astri-ṇaḥ-t,</td>
<td>ἑστόρ-νῦ-(τ).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLURAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>stri-ṇu-mas,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stri-ṇu-tha,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stri-ṇu-anti,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>astri-ṇu-ma,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>astri-ṇu-ta,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>astri-ṇu-an,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

489. The Sanskrit reduplicated preterite receives Guna before the light terminations, and restores the pure root-vowel again before the heavy. Herein the Germanic, and most evidently in the Gothic, stands in closest accordance with the Sanskrit, inasmuch as all verbs, with a root-vowel

---

* The grammarians assume a root सृ strī and another सृ strī, both of which signify “to strew,” and have, properly, for their radical syllable stra=Greek ΣTOP, Latin STER, the a of which is subject to suppression (Vocalismus, Obs. I. p. 167, and on the root in question, especially, l.c. p. 179.)
susceptible of Guna (*i.e.* with *i* or *u*), insert before this, in
the singular of the simple (strong) preterite, the original
Guna vowel *a*; but before the increasing terminations of the
two plural numbers, as also in the entire subjunctive, which
is burthened by the exponent of the mood,  [G. Ed. p. 707.]
and is already in the singular polysyllabic, again reject the
foreign strengthening vowel. Compare—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>SANSKRIT.</strong></th>
<th><strong>GOTHIC.</strong></th>
<th><strong>SANSKRIT.</strong></th>
<th><strong>GOTHIC.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ROOT.</strong></td>
<td><strong>ROOT.</strong></td>
<td><strong>ROOT.</strong></td>
<td><strong>ROOT.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>bhid,</em> &quot;to split.&quot;</td>
<td><em>bit,</em> &quot;to bite.&quot;</td>
<td><em>bhuj,</em> &quot;to bend.&quot;</td>
<td><em>bug,</em> &quot;to bend.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SINGULAR.</strong></td>
<td><strong>SINGULAR.</strong></td>
<td><strong>SINGULAR.</strong></td>
<td><strong>SINGULAR.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>bhhēda,</em></td>
<td><em>bait,</em></td>
<td><em>bhhōja,</em></td>
<td><em>baug.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>bhhēditha,</em></td>
<td><em>baist,</em></td>
<td><em>bhhōjitha,</em></td>
<td><em>baugt.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>bhhēda,</em></td>
<td><em>bait,</em></td>
<td><em>bhhōja,</em></td>
<td><em>baug.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DUAL.</strong></td>
<td><strong>DUAL.</strong></td>
<td><strong>DUAL.</strong></td>
<td><strong>DUAL.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>bhhidiva,</em></td>
<td><em>bitā,</em></td>
<td><em>bhhujiva,</em></td>
<td><em>bugā.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>bhhidathus,</em></td>
<td><em>bituts,</em></td>
<td><em>bhhujathus,</em></td>
<td><em>buguts.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>bhhidatus,</em></td>
<td><em>...</em></td>
<td><em>bhhujatus</em></td>
<td><em>...</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PLURAL.</strong></td>
<td><strong>PLURAL.</strong></td>
<td><strong>PLURAL.</strong></td>
<td><strong>PLURAL.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>bhhidima,</em></td>
<td><em>bitum,</em></td>
<td><em>bhhujima,</em></td>
<td><em>bugum.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>bhhida(th)</em></td>
<td><em>bituth,</em></td>
<td><em>bhhuja(th)</em></td>
<td><em>buguth.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>bhhidus,</em></td>
<td><em>bitun,</em></td>
<td><em>bhhujus,</em></td>
<td><em>bugun.</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

490. On the law of gravity rests also the phenomenon,
that those Gothic roots ending in two consonants, which,
without protecting the reduplication, have preserved a radi-
cal *a* in the singular of the preterite, weaken* this to *u*
before the heavy plural and dual terminations, and those of
the whole subjunctive (Vocalismus, Obs. 16. p. 227). The
Sanskrit exhibits a remarkable counterpart to this phenome-
on, which had not come under my notice in my earlier
treatment of the theory of gravity, and is  [G. Ed. p. 708.]
here for the first time considered from this point of view;—

* In the German preterite, the weakening of the vowel is produced by
the polysyllabicness, see p. 709. G. cd.
I mean the root kar, "to make," which—not indeed in the reduplicated preterite, but still in the special tenses before the heavy terminations, and in the whole potential, which answers to the Gothic subjunctive—weakens its a to u, and only before light terminations retains the heavy a sound. Hence karòmi, "I make," stands in quite the same relation to kurumas or kurmas, "we make," and to kuryâm, "I may make," as, in Gothic, band to bundum, and bundyau. We compare here the Gothic preterite band with the Sanskrit babhandha, which everywhere leaves its vowel unaltered, and with karòmi as regards the change of vowel.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SINGULAR</th>
<th>DUAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SANSKRIT.</td>
<td>GOTHIC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>babandha,</td>
<td>band,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>babandhitha,</td>
<td>banst,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>babandha,</td>
<td>band,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLURAL.</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SANSKRIT.</td>
<td>GOTHIC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>babandhima,</td>
<td>bundum,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>babandha(tha),</td>
<td>bunduth,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>babandhus,</td>
<td>bundun,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POTENTIAL.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SANSKRIT.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kuryâm,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kuryâs,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kuryât,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[G. Ed. p.709.] "Remark 1.—As all verbs which, in the preterite, follow the analogy of band, have a liquid for their penultimate consonant, and liquids have a preference for the vowel u, we may attribute to them here an influence on the generation of the u: it remains, however, not the less true, that the conditions under which, in the foregoing scheme, a and u are interchanged, rest only on the
laws of gravity, and on a principle sufficiently, as I believe, demonstrated in my Vocalismus (p. 227), that the weight of the u is more easily supported by these languages than that of a. For were this not so, it were difficult to see why the old a was protected exactly in the monosyllabic singular; and why the condition of monosyllabicness is so enforced in the preservation of the a, that, in Old High German, where the second person singular is designated by i instead of t,* even in the form which thus becomes dissyllabic, the lighter u should assume the place of the heavier a; and thus bundi stand in contrast to band of the first and third person, and to the Gothic second banst. In like sense a certain share in the generation of the u may, in the Sanskrit form kur, alternating with kar, be attributed to the liquid, while the distribution between the a and u forms depends on the weight of the terminations alone. Beyond the range, however, of the special tenses, the root kar, in the forms which seek to be lightened, dispenses entirely with the a, so that the r becomes the vowel ri. The mutilated form kri thus produced—as, for instance, in kri-ta, 'made,' opposed to kar-tum, 'to make'—is considered by the grammarians as the original, and this holds good in analogous cases;—a view which I have endeavoured, in the first Observation of my Vocalismus, to demonstrate as historically unsustainable. In special Sanskrit grammars, however, this system may be outwardly maintained; and kar may still pass for a Guna form of kri; as also we may be compelled to treat the a of the Gothic preterite band as the Guna form of i in binda, and so, indeed, we must, if, reversing the real historical course of the language, we recognise, in the singular a of the preterite, a first, and, in the plural and subjunctive u of the preterite, a second Ablaut of the i of the present binda."

* For the origin of this i I refer preliminarily to my Vocalismus, p. 23.
"Remark 2.—It may appear surprising that those Gothic verbs with a radical a, which, in the preterite, have preserved the old reduplication, do not equally weaken their a to u before the heavy terminations; that, for instance, haihald, [G. Ed. p.710.] in the plural, should form, not haihuldum, but hailhaldum, although the root has equally a liquid for its penultimate; and we might imagine that the burthening of the root by reduplication would occasion still more susceptibility for the weight of the terminations; as we have seen, in Sanskrit, that the reduplicating roots of the third class in ए either weaken or totally remove that vowel before the heavy terminations (§.481.), but the non-reduplicating roots of the second class experience no diminution. With the Gothic reduplication of the preterite we find a peculiar condition: it can only be borne by the strongest radical structure, and has hence only been perpetuated, first, by verbs with a long or diphthongal radical vowel; as haihuit, 'I was named,' present haita; hlailaup, 'I ran,' present hlaupe; secondly, by roots with the heaviest of the short vowels (a), united with length by position; for instance, vaivald, 'I directed,' present valda.*

Under these conditions, it was a necessity of the language to retain the root after the reduplication in all its strength, and by this the weakening of the a to u was provided against."

491. The Greek exhibits the Guna modification of the ए in two forms, in that, namely, the original pre-inserted a sound is represented either by e or o, but au never answers to the Sanskrit ए in roots in which diphthongs are exchanged with a pure ए.† Where, however, ē and ō,

* Faifah, from the root fah, "to seize," and haihah, from hah, "to hang," make an exception, but appear, on the evidence of cognate dialects, to have lost a nasal.
† Vocalismus, Obs. 2. p. 193.
together with \( i \), are exchanged with each other in one and the same root; there \( o \), as the heavier of the two Gunas, takes its place in the perfect, where also the simple \( o \) is frequently opposed to the simple \( e \); hence, for instance, \( \lambda \ell \alpha \omega \iota \pi \alpha \) opposed to \( \lambda \varepsilon \iota \pi \omega \), \( \varepsilon \lambda \iota \pi \omega ; \) \( \pi \varepsilon \omega \iota \theta \alpha \) to \( \pi \varepsilon \iota \omega \), \( \varepsilon \pi \iota \theta \omega \), as \( \tau \varepsilon \rho \omega \alpha \) to \( \tau \varepsilon \rho \phi \omega \). Thus \( o \) answers to the Gothic Guna through \( a \), and \( e \) to that through \( i \) (§ 27); and \( \pi \varepsilon \iota \omega \) and \( \pi \varepsilon \omega \iota \theta \alpha \) are related to each other, as \( b e i t a \) (i.e. \( b i l u \) [G. Ed. p. 711.] from \( b i i \), p. 106) to \( b a i t \) from the root \( b i t \); then, also, \( \tau \varepsilon \rho \omega \alpha \) to \( \tau \varepsilon \rho \phi \omega \alpha \), as \( l i s a \) to \( l a s \) from the root \( L A S \) (p. 116 G. ed.). It appears, therefore, that the Greek too bears more willingly the burthen of reduplication by a stronger than a weaker root-syllable. The susceptibility towards the weight of terminations has, however, almost entirely vanished from the Greek perfect. A remnant of it is still found in \( o \theta \alpha \), opposed to the Sanskrit \( v e d a \), "I know," and the Gothic \( v a i t \).* in all three languages a present as to sense, with the terminations of the reduplicated preterite. Yet the Sanskrit verb, in this signification, dispenses with the reduplication, and so does the Greek; for \( o \theta \alpha \) for \( F o \theta \alpha \) is merely the Guna of the root \( (F)i\delta \). Compare—

**SANSKRIT.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sanskrit</th>
<th>Gothic</th>
<th>Greek</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>वेद वेद-( a )</td>
<td>( vait )</td>
<td>( o\theta-\alpha )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>वेध वेध-( tha )</td>
<td>( vais-t )</td>
<td>( o\iota-\theta\alpha ) (see §. 453)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>विदित</td>
<td>विद-( i ) वा</td>
<td>विद-( i ) वा</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>विद्रवेदुस् विद-( a )-( thus )</td>
<td>( vit-u-ts )</td>
<td>( o\iota-t) ( o\iota-n )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>विद्रवेदुस् विद-( a )-( tus )</td>
<td>( vit-u-ts )</td>
<td>( o\iota-t) ( o\iota-n )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>विद्रवेदुस् विद-( i )-( ma )</td>
<td>( vit-u-m )</td>
<td>( o\iota-\mu e)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>विद्रवेदुस् विद-( (\chi) ) विद-( a )-( (\theta) )</td>
<td>( vit-u-th )</td>
<td>( o\iota-\tau e )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>विद्रवेदुस् विद-( a )-( us ) (see §. 462.)</td>
<td>( vit-u-n )</td>
<td>( o\iota-\alpha -\sigma )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* In the case of this verb the modern German language has preserved the operation of the influence of the terminations; hence, \( w i s s e n \), \( w i s s e l \), \( w i s s e n \), opposed to \( weiss \), \( w e i s s t \), \( weiss \); while elsewhere the plural has everywhere made itself equal in weight to the singular.
"Remark.—The Sanskrit root *vid* is not without a proper present—वेद्मि *vedmi*, the plural of which, *vid-mas*, *vit-tha*, *vid-anti*, might have equally given, in Greek, ἴσ-μεν, ἴσ-τε, *iσ-ασί* (from ἴσαντι, p. 663 G. ed.); as also out of the duals *vit-thus*, *vit-tas*, we could hardly obtain in Greek any thing else than ἴσ-τον, ἴσ-τον. The present forms resemble the Greek much more than those above of the preterite. Nevertheless, I am not of opinion that the Greek plural and dual terminations can belong to the present in their origin, for the intermediate vowel ἄ, whose rejection gives to ἴσμεν the appearance of a present (compare ἐσ-μέν), is no essential element of the perfect, and is wanting, among other instances, in ἐκ-τόν; which, moreover, through the restoration of the pure radical vowel, bears the same relation to ἐκικε, as ἴστον to ὁδε. We shall recur to this subject."

492. After what we have hitherto remarked on the laws of gravity, it becomes scarcely necessary to quote instances to shew which are the light terminations, and which the heavy. It is self-evident that the dual and plural endings have more body and compass than the singular of the transitive active form, and that in the middle voice the weight of terminations communicates itself also to the singular; for μα, σα, τα, are obviously richer in sound than μι, σι, τι: in the same manner, in the secondary forms, μη, σο, το, are heavier than ν, σ, (τ). We have, however, to observe, that several terminations, originally heavy, but which have, in the course of time, become abbreviated, have nevertheless left behind them the effect of their former state. This is the case especially in the Sanskrit, in which the middle abibhr-i (see p. 471 G. ed.) is much weaker in its termination than the transitive abibhar-am; so that, according to the present state of the language, we should rather expect abibhr-am answering to abibhar-i than the reverse. The second person plural of the transitive reduplicate preterite, like the first and third of the singular, has lost the true personal sign, and retained only the
intermediate vowel. Nevertheless, we find above vida, "ye know," over against the singular vėda, "I know," "he knows." In the second person plural of [G. Ed. p. 713] the primary forms, thā is, in its present state, heavier than the singular si, as a is heavier than i, and the Sanskrit aspirates are evident combinations of an h with the full tenues or medials (§. 12). In Greek, all the terminations (if we except, perhaps, the relation of τε to θα, as in ἵσ-τε, contrasted with ὁσ-θα), which I reckon heavy, have still, in their actual state, more weight than those which, according to the theory which has been brought forward, belong to the light class. Compare—

**DIVISION OF CONJUGATIONS.**

493. Sanskrit verbs admit of an easy distribution into two conjugations; the first—which, if not the oldest, existed before the separation of languages, and is almost alone represented in the European cognate languages—comprehends the great majority of all the verbs, viz. classes 1. 4. 6. 10. (§. 109*), which, in the special tenses, annex to the root either a simple a (cl. 1. and 6.), or syllables which terminate with a, viz. ya and aya (cl. 4. and 10.). This con- [G. Ed. p. 714.] jugation is followed also, as will hereafter appear, by nearly all derivative verbs and by all denominatives. In Greek, the conjugation in ω corresponds to it, in which, of course, too

* See §. 471.
much stress must not be laid on the ω answering to the Sanskrit mi, for if the μ is restored to the τέρπω, compared above (§. 434.) with ταρπ-δ-μι; and if τέρπεις, τέρπεi, are carried back to the forms τέρπ-ε-σι, τέρπ-ε-τι, which, in all probability, once existed; still this verb, and all of similar structure, remain sufficiently distinguished from all classes of the so-called μι conjugation, which does not contain any verbs that insert between the root and the personal terminations an ε, which is interchanged with ο, and is foreign to the root, or larger syllables terminating with these vowels. The second Sanskrit conjugation separates, like the Greek, into three divisions. It comprehends first, those verbs which append the personal terminations direct to the root (Cl. 2. 3. 7.), as ἥ-μι=εἰ-μ; δαδ-μι=διδωμι; yunaj-mi, “jungo,” plural yunj-mas, “junyimus,” (§. 109*. 3.), to which there is no analogy in Greek; secondly, verbs with νυ or υ, in Greek νυ, ιυ, as the intermediate syllable; thirdly, those with ιδ (weakened to ιδι), in Greek νά (νη), νά (see pp. 119, 703 G. ed.). All these divisions are, in Sanskrit as in Greek, subjected to the influence of the weight of the personal terminations, while the first conjugation is free from it. Other peculiarities will be presented hereafter, in which the Sanskrit and Greek second conjugation coincide with one another, and are distinguished from the first conjugation.

494. The Greek first conjugation contains a greater variety of subdivisions than the Sanskrit, which consists of only four classes. This, however, has no influence on the

[G. Ed. p. 715.] inflection, since τέρπ-ο-μεν* is inflected just like τύπ-το-μεν, δάκ-νο-μεν, ιζ-άνο-μεν, λαμβ-άνο-μεν, πράς-σο-μεν, δαμ-άζω-μεν, ὀδ-ιζο-μεν; as it is the same, with regard to the conjugation, whether the formation, which is added to the root, consists simply of one ε, which, before nasals, is replaced by o, or of syllables which terminate with

* I give the plural, as the abbreviation of the singular primary termination renders the character of formation not easily perceptible.
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this vowel; as, in Sanskrit, the formations a, ya, and aya, are inflected similarly, for this very reason, that they all end in a. It appears to me, however, wrong to separate, in Greek, the consonants from their vowels, and, e.g., in τομομεν to add, first a τ and then a conjunctive vowel o; while, according to the course of the development of the language, the root τυν, in the special tenses, combines with the syllable τε or το, δακ with νε or νο, and λαβ with ἀνέ or ἀνο. The addition of a bare consonant, or of a syllable terminating with a consonant, would have been too cumbrous for the conjugation: a τυν-τ-μεν or δακ-ν-μεν can never have existed. But if we are right in dividing thus, δείκ-νυ-μεν, and do not regard the ν merely as the element of formation, and the ν as the conjunctive vowel, there is no reason to distribute τομομεν according to a different principle. What the syllable το is in the latter verb, the syllable νυ is in the former. For this reason I cannot admit that mode of distinguishing the conjugation in ο from that in μ, which consists in terming the latter "with a conjunctive vowel"; as the μ conjugation also, though not in all the classes of which it consists, has syllables of conjunction, if they are to be so called, that are inserted in δείκ-νυ-μεν, δάμ-να-μεν, between the root and the personal termination.

495. It is hardly possible to state anything satisfactory regarding the origin of these syllables. It appears to me most probable that the majority of them [G. Ed. p. 716.] are pronouns, through which the action or quality, which is expressed in the root in abstracto, becomes something concrete; e.g. the expression of the idea "to love" becomes the expression of the person, "who loves." This person, however, is more closely defined by the personal termination, whether it be "I," "thou," or "he." Proceeding from this point of view, we may regard the character of the Sanskrit ninth class nd (§ 109 5.) = Greek νά, νη, να, as the lengthening of the pronominal base, ना, न (§ 369.) and
nu = Greek νυ, as the weakening of this na, as, in the interrogative, together with ka the forms ku and ki occur. The u of the eighth class is easily perceived to be the abbreviation of the syllable nu, which arises from the circumstance that the few roots of this class themselves terminate with n; thus tan-u-mas for tan-nu-mas. The sole exception is kri, "to make," which, however, as may be deduced from the Zend kērē-naō-mi, likewise had n originally before the appended u. From ना nd it seems that ṅṇ has arisen by transposition, which is further combined with the character a of the first or sixth class, and belongs to the first conjugation; but it occurs only in the second person imperative singular of the transitive active form of the ninth class, in which the first conjugation is without the personal termination; hence, as-āṇa, "eat," opposed to the first person as-ndni, and the third as-nātu. This as-āṇa would lead us to expect a present as-āṇa-mi, as-āṇa-si, as-āṇa-ti, for as-nd-mi, &c. The circumstance that the Vēda-dialect has not preserved forms of that kind affords no certainty that they have never existed; for although several other ancient forms of speech have been preserved in the Vēda-dialect, still it is very far from having retained, in their perfect state, all that existed at the period of the unity of language; e.g. there are no middle forms in mē for the abbreviated e. But if the Sanskrit, in its

[Page 717.] formations in āna, actually took its departure from the second person imperative, where it also remained, the Greek has completed the formation thus commenced; for I have scarce any doubt that forms like as-āna are the prototypes of the Greek ζ-αυε, δάρθ-αυε, &c. Both languages agree in their conjugational affixes almost as exactly as possible; for a Greek ā refers rather to a Sanskrit long ā than to a short one, as ᾦ a is more frequently represented by e or o than by a. Besides, the original length of quantity is still left in ἰκάνω. In
Lithuanian, verbs in *enu* and *inu*, and also those with doubled *n*, *innu*, belong to this class, though they retain the nasal, also, in the future and infinitive, which verbs in *nu*, of which hereafter, do not, e.g. *gab-enų*, "I bring;" *gad-inų*, "I destroy," future *gabei su*, *gadinti su* (§. 10.), infinitive *gabeinti*, *gadinti*.

496. If, in the Sanskrit seventh class (§. 109*. 3.), that form, which appears before light terminations, is older than that which occurs before heavy ones, e.g. *bhi-na-d* from *bhi-nad-mi*, "I cleave," older than *bhi-n-d* from *bhi-nd-mas*, "we cleave," then it might be assumed, as I am much inclined to do, that this syllable *nَْا* is nothing else than the syllable *nَْا* of the ninth class, which has been transposed into the interior of the root, and abbreviated; thus, *bhinadmi* for *bhidnami*, as *bhid* would form according to the ninth class. In Greek verbs, like *λαμβάνω*, *μανθάνω*, both forms occur together; and in them the nasal of derivation has a second time been reflected into the middle of the root, just as, in Zend, an *i* or *y* imparts to the preceding syllable also an *i* (§. 41.). It has been already remarked (§. 109*. 5.), that verbs, like *δάκ-νο-μεν*, *τέμ-νο-μεν*, by weakening the syllable of derivation, i.e. by changing the organic *α* of *δάμ-να-μεν* for the inorganic *e* or *o*, have entered into the *ω* conjugation. [G. Ed. p. 718.]

To this place, also, must be assigned the Latin formation *ni* (before *r: ne*) of *ster-ni-mus*, *cer-ni-mus*, *sper-ni-mus*, *li-ni-mus*, *si-ni-mus*. Compare, for instance, *ster-ni-mus* with *स्त्रीममः* *stri-ni-mas*; but the resemblance must not be rated too high, for the Latin *nǐ* is not a shortened form of the Sanskrit *nَْا* (see §. 485.), but *a* weakened, as *leg-i-mus* for *leg-ā-mus*, (§. 109*. 1.). In Old Slavonic, verbs in *nَا*, *nēshi*, correspond, which reject this appended syllable in the preterite, e.g. *гыб-нَا*, "pereo," second person *gyb-ne-shi*, preterite *gy-boch* (Dobr. p. 355.); in Lithuanian, verbs in *nu*, plural

*Cf. p. 996, §. 743.*
na-mē, correspond, which, though sparingly, are retained in roots in au (Mielke, p. 101, 25.); e.g. gāu-nu, “I avow,” plural gāu-na-me, preterite gauau, future gausu. Compare—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GREEK.</th>
<th>OLD SCLAV.</th>
<th>LITHUAN.</th>
<th>LATIN.</th>
<th>SANSKRĪT.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ḍāk-vo,</td>
<td>gyb-nu-ũ,</td>
<td>gāu-nu,</td>
<td>ster-no’</td>
<td>stri-nā-mi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ḍāk-vei-s,</td>
<td>gyb-ne-shi,</td>
<td>gāu-n’i,</td>
<td>ster-ni-s,</td>
<td>stri-ṇā-si.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ḍāk-ve(-τ),</td>
<td>gyb-ne-ty,</td>
<td>gāu-na’</td>
<td>ster-ni-t,</td>
<td>stri-ṇā-ti.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

......    | gyb-ne-wa, | gāu-na-wa, | ......    | stri-ṇā-was. |
| ḍāk-ve-tov, | gyb-ne-ta, | gāu-na-ta, | ......    | stri-ṇē-thas. |
| ḍāk-ve-tov, | gyb-ne-ta, | gāu-na’    | ......    | stri-ṇē-tas. |

| ḍāk-vo-µev, | gyb-ne-m,  | gāu-na-me, | ster-ni-mus, | stri-ṇī-mus. |
| ḍāk-ve-te,  | gyb-ne-te, | gāu-na-te,  | ster-ni-tis, | stri-ṇī-tha. |
| ḍāk-vo-nvi, | gyb-nā-ty, | gāu-na’    | ster-nu-nt,  | stri-ṇa-uti. |

1 Hence an entirely legitimate division is impossible, since the personal termination has likewise a share in the u of derivation, its nasal being contained in it: see §. 255. g. 2 See p. 630 G. ed.

497. The affix te, το (τύπ-το-µev, τύπ-τε-τε), appears peculiar to Greek: however, except in πέκτω, τίκτω, it occurs [G. Ed. p. 719.] only after labials. Its τ is, perhaps, a corruption of ν, as elsewhere, also, we have seen mutes proceed from nasals of corresponding organ; e.g. βροτός from μροτός; in Lithuanian and Slavonic dewyni, δεβατον dewyaty (§. 317.), from newyni, newyaṭy; and (which comes tolerably near to the case in question) the Greek suffix ματ, used in the formation of words, corresponds to a formation in n in the kindred languages; e.g. ὀ-νοματ answers to the Sanskrit nāman, Latin nomen, to the Gothic namō, namin-s, and Slavonic имa imya, genitive имене imen-e (§. 269.). In Sanskrit, also, we must remark that the n is replaced by the tenuis of its organ, since, for instance, from han, “to slay,” comes the causal ghāt-ayā-mi for hān-ayā-mi. If, then, the τ of τύπ-το-µev, κρύπ-το-µev, &c., stands in this manner for ν, then these verbs, just as those in νο-µev, νε-τε
(§. 109* 5.), lead back to the Sanskrit ninth class. But if the τ is organic, which is less probable, then, according to the principle laid down in §. 495., the syllable τε, το, leads to the pronominal base το = Sanskrit ṭa (§. 343.).

498. In Lithuanian there are some verbs which resemble Greek verbs like τυπτω in this point, that they insert between the root and the personal termination an affix beginning with t and terminating with a vowel, though they reject it again in the preterite, which answers to the Greek imperfect, and in which otherwise the class syllables are still retained. Thus klys-tu (euphonic for klyd-tu, compare §. 457.), plural klys-ta-me, preterite klyd-au, future kly-su, as ἐπεί-σω for ἐπείδ-σω; plās-tu (for plād-tu), “I swim” (compare plu, p. 114), plural plās-ta-me, preterite plād-au; lōsz-tu, “I am petulant,” plural lōsz-ta-me, preterite lōsz-au; mirsz-tu, “I forget,”* plural [G. Ed. p. 720.] mirsz-ta-me, preterite mirsz-au; plysz-tu, “I tear to pieces,” plural plysz-ta-me, preterite plysz-au. Some verbs prefix to the t a non-radical s also, for which the way is perhaps prepared by cases in which a sibilant, or a d which changes into s, is already in the root, or because st is in general a favourite termination (compare §. 94.); as, rim-stu, “I am quiet” (Sanskrit vi-ram, “to rest”), plural rim-sta-me, preterite rimm-au, future rim-su.

499. I believe a pronominal origin must be ascribed, also, to the e, o, of verbs like τέρπο-μεν, τέρπε-τε, which is usually called a conjunctive vowel; for the ᾧ a, which answers to it in Sanskrit, is deducible from a pronominal base more easily than any other conjugational affix, and it proceeds, in fact, from the base from which we have above seen a-smdī, “to this,” a-smāt, “from this,” a-sya, “of this,” and a-smīn, “in this,” proceed. For a mere conjunctive vowel, a, as the heaviest of the three primary

vowels, appears to me least of all adapted; and I think that the origin of conjunctive vowels, which are inserted between two consonants to facilitate pronunciation, belongs to a later period of the language than that to which the coincidences of the Sanskrit with its European cognate languages conduct us back. The ए a in question, however, coincides with the Gothic a which is interchanged with i, with the Greek e interchangeable with o, Old Sclavonic e e, Lithuanian a, and Latin i (§. 109a. 1.); e.g. in the second person dual, वहाः vah-a-thas, answering to the Gothic vij-a-ts, Greek εχε-τον, Old Sclavonic везета vez-e-ta, Lithuanian wez-a-ta; second person plural वहाः vah-a-tha, answering to the Greek εχε-τε, Old Sclavonic везете vez-e-te, Lithuanian wez-a-te, Latin veh-i-tis, Gothic vij-i-th. The case is different with the lightest of the primary vowels, i, with which we shall hereafter become acquainted in considering the Sanskrit auxiliary future. No analogous vowel can be assigned to this i in the kindred languages, and we must therefore fix its origin in the period succeeding

[G. Ed. p. 721.] the division of languages. In Zend, we see some conjunctive vowels arise, as it were, under our eyes, i.e. vowels which enter between two consonants that were formerly combined: this never occurs, however, with an a, but with the inorganic e ē (§. 30.), for which i is sometimes found; e.g. us-ē-hista, "stand up," in which an i is inserted between the preposition and the verb, which never happens in Sanskrit.

500. The affixes of the fourth and tenth classes, य aya and चय aya, must, I believe, be regarded as auxiliary verbs: य aya is, at the same time, the character of the passive, and we shall recur to it in treating of that voice. In Gothic, we have already found a representative of the Sanskrit fourth class (§. 109a. 2.): in Latin, verbs in io, of the third conjugation, correspond to it. These, in disadvantageous comparison with the Gothic, have permitted the
vowel of the syllable ya to disappear almost everywhere, e.g. in all the cases in which the a of the first and sixth class has been weakened to i, before r to ē; hence, spec-io, spec-i-unt, answering to the Sanskrit pas-yā-mi, paś-ya-nṭi, but spec-i-s, spec-i-t, spec-i-mus, spec-i-tis, contrasted with paś-ya-si, paś-ya-ti, paś-yā-mas, paś-ya-tha. In the participle present, the a of the syllable ya has been retained under the protection of two consonants; hence, spec-ie-ns, spec-ie-ntem, answering to paś-ya-n, paś-ya-nṭum. Facio, according to its origin, should follow the fourth conjugation, as it is based on the Sanskrit causal form, bhāvayāmi, “I make to be” (§. 19.): on account, however, of the trifling difference in form between -yāmi and -ayāmi, it cannot surprise us that the said Latin verb has deserted its original class, and migrated to that next adjoining. Thus, vice versā, cupio = kupyā-mi, “I am angry,” has partly changed into the fourth conjugation, which corresponds to the Sanskrit tenth class, and to which belong cupāvi, cupātum, [G. Ed. p. 722.] while the present has remained in the class to which this verb originally belongs. In Lithuanian, verbs in iu, yu, of Mielke’s first conjugation (p. 96, &c.) correspond; e.g. liepyu, “I order,” which, like similar verbs with a labial termination to the root, rejects indeed the y before the i of the second person, but otherwise retains the class syllable inviolate throughout the whole present. In Slavonic, Dobrowsky’s first conjugation belongs to this class, which, in the present, with the exception of the first person singular, and third person plural, exhibits the syllable ए ya in the form of ए ye, but only after vowels: after consonants, only the e of the ए ye is left, as in other parts, also, of grammar e e is very frequently the remnant of the syllable ए ye, as the euphonic product of yo (§§. 255. n. and 258.). In the first person singular and third person plural, we find, both after vowels and consonants, yā, yāty, from yo-m, yo-nty, (§. 255. g.), and, in the gerund (participial) present yā.
feminine ýšči, answering to the Sanskrit yan, yanti. Examples are: pi-yá, “I drink,”* second person pi-ye-ši,”† third person pi-ye-ty; ζ na-yá, “I know” (Sanskrit jnd, “to know”) ζ na-ye-ši, ζ na-ye-ty; or-yá, “I plough,” or-e-ši, or-e-ty. Compare—

**VERBS.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sanskrit</th>
<th>Lith.</th>
<th>Old Sclav.</th>
<th>Gothic</th>
<th>Latin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>lubh-ýa-mi</td>
<td>liep-yu</td>
<td>ζ na-ýa</td>
<td>haf-ya</td>
<td>cap-io</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lubh-ýa-si</td>
<td>liep-i</td>
<td>ζ na-ye-shi</td>
<td>haf-yi-s</td>
<td>cap-i-s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lubh-ýa-ti</td>
<td>liep-ya</td>
<td>ζ na-ye-ty</td>
<td>haf-yi-th</td>
<td>cap-i-t</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

lubh-ýa-vas | liep-ya-wa | ζ na-ye-va | haf-ya-s |
| lubh-ýa-thas | liep-ya-ta | ζ na-ye-ta | haf-ya-ts |
| lubh-ýa-tas | liep-ya’ | ζ na-ye-ta’ |

lubh-ýa-mas | liep-ya-me | ζ na-ye-m | haf-ya-m | cap-i-mus |
| lubh-ýa-tha | liep-ya-te | ζ na-ye-te | haf-yi-th | cap-i-tis |
| lubh-ýa-nthi | liep-ya’ | ζ na-ýa-ty | haf-ya-nd | cap-iu-nt |

1 “I desire,” compare lubet, libet, Gothic lieubs, “dear.” 2 See p. 692, Note 1. 3 The Gothic haf-ya, German heben, “to raise,” is radically identical with the Latin capio, the law of transposition being followed (§ 87.). 4 A completely legitimate division is impossible in this word (see § 255. g.).

501. As the Lithuanian readily assimilates the semi-vowel y to a stronger consonant preceding it (compare p. 369 G. ed.), it need not surprise us if this occasionally occurs also in the class of verbs under discussion. To this we refer verbs in mmu (according to Mielke, p. 101, 23.), which, in the preterite, again restore their second m to the y, whence it arose,

* The Sanskrit root pi is used only in the middle, but belongs, in like manner, to the fourth class; hence, pi-yé, pi-yasé, &c.
† Dobrowsky writes, p. 321, biyeshi, biety, from the root bi, “to cut”; but Kopitar, whom I follow, gives biyeshi, &c. If the first reading were correct, it must be assumed that after i the y of the class-syllable would be dropped before e.
but, in the future and infinitive, according to the old principle, entirely withdraw the class syllable; as immu, "I take," preterite ἐμναυ, future imsu, infinitive inti. Gemmu, "I am born," has, in the preterite, together with gimnyau also the assimilated form gimmau. The root gim answers to the Sanskrit जन jan, which, in the sense of "to be born," is likewise included in the fourth class, but which irregularly suppresses the n before the character य ya, and, in compensation, lengthens the vowel. As, however, jan, "nasci," is used only in the middle, and the passive, on account of its character ya, is identical with the middle of the fourth class, nothing prevents us from regarding जावे jāvē, "nascor," as passive, and thus recognising in the Lithuanian gemmu a remnant of the Sanskrit passive, only [G. Ed. p. 724.] with the loss of the middle terminations. We should also remark the admirable agreement between the Lithuanian luppu, "I peel," "I skin," which is based on assimilation, and the Sanskrit lup-ya-mi, from the root lup, "to cleave," "to destroy," "to trouble." Hence the transition is very close to Greek verbs with double consonants, in the special tenses; for the form ἀλλας, as contrasted with the Gothic ALYGA, has furnished us with the first proof, that, in Greek, the semi-vowel y still exists in the form of a retroacting assimilation,* for comparatives like κρείσσων, ἐλάσσων, are traced back to this principle (§. 300.), to which, also, verbs with σ or λ doubled in the special tenses are subjected; thus λίσσωμαι from λιτγωμαι, as κρείσσων from κρειτγων or κρατγων; φρίσσω from φρίκυς, as γλύσσων from γλυκύων (γλυκίων); πτύσσω from πτυχυςω, as πάσσων from πάχυων (παχίων). According to this principle, γ also becomes σ; e.g. τάσσω from ταχυςω, to which the comparatives do not supply any analogy, as might have been expected in μέγας. As, however, μείζων is used for μεγίων from μεγγων, so also

* Demonstrative Bases, p. 20.
in the ζ of some verbs the retroactive influence of an earlier 
y might be conjectured; thus άζω (with ἀγιος = Sanskrit 
षण, "to adore," "to sacrifice,") from ἀγγω; ψφάζω from 
φαζω; ἵζω from ἵδω; βράζω with βράσσω from βράδυω 
or βραχυω.

502. Most verbs in σσω are denominatives; and it is here 
important to remark, that, in Sanskrit also, the syllable θ ya 
forms denominatives, as chird-yll-mi, "I hesitate," from chira 
"slow"; sābdā-yll-mi, "I sound," from sābdn, "sound"; asū-
yll-mi, "I curse," from asu, "life"; namas-yll-mi, "I adore," 
[G. Ed. p. 725.] from namas, "adoration." Thus, in Greek, 
amongst others, αιμάσσω from αιματγω from ΑΙΜΑΤ; κο-
ρύσσω from κορυθγω from ΚΟΡΥΘ; ταράσσω from ταραχγω 
from ΤΑΡΑΧΗ; πτερύσσομαι from πτερυγγομαι from ΠΤΕ-
ΡΥΓ; κηρύσσω from κηρυγγω from ΚΗΡΥΓ. The numerous 
denominatives, also, in αζω and ιζω might be referred to 
this class, the semi-vowel θ y being represented by ζ.* 
The question is, whether the α and ι of forms like εινάζω, 
άκμάζω, δικάζω, ἀγελάζω, ἀγοράζω, πολεμίζω, ἀθροίζω, 
άφριζω, belong to the primitive noun, or to the verbal 
derivative. It must be considered an important argu-
ment in favour of the former view, that αζω, in that kind of 
denominatives, for the most part occurs only where an α or η 
is already contained in the base noun, but η according to its 
origin = α (§. 4.). If, therefore, δικάζω comes from δικη (δικά), 
then the final vowel of the base word has only been weakened 
in the most natural manner, and it would therefore be also only 
a weakening of the vowel, if ο, springing from short α, should 
become i (§. 6.), and e.g. πολεμίζω should stand for πολεμό-ζω. 
And it need not surprise us if η (ά) were at times weakened a 
stage further than to α, viz. to ι, and, e.g., αυλι-ζομαι were 
derived from αυλη, by changing the η into ι. Bases ending

* See §. 19. From this interchange an affinity of the Greek ζεά, ζέα, 
to the Sanskrit याण, "barley," may be deduced; thus, ζεά, for ζεά. 
with a consonant observe, if this opinion be just, a double course of procedure: either the final consonant is suppressed, or an i added to it as a conjunctive vowel. The former occurs principally in words which have already become accustomed, through the nominative (accusative), to the loss of their final consonant; the latter principally in those words that retain their final consonant, or the former of two in the nominative; hence, χειμάζω from ΧΕΙΜΑΤ; ὄνομάζω from ὌΝΟΜΑΤ; παίζω from ΠΑΙΔ; ἄσπιζομαι, from ἌΣΠΙΔ; but [G. Ed. p. 728.] ἀνδρ-ι-ζω, γαστρ-ι-ζω, αὐχεν-ι-ζω, ἀκοντ-ι-ζω, ἀγων-ι-ζομαι, ἀλοκ-ι-ζω. Deviations from the prevailing principle are αἰματ-ι-ζω, ἐρματ-ι-ζω, παραδειγματ-ι-ζω, κυματ-ι-ζω, σπερματ-ι-ζω, σοδ-ι-ζω; and, on the other hand, μαστί-ζω, σαλπί-ζω, συρί-ζω, for μαστιγ-ι-ζω, &c. The Σ of words like τείχος belongs, indeed, as has been before shewn (§ 128.), to the base; notwithstanding, no derivations exist like τειχεσ-ι-ζω, since, at the time when these verbs originated, it was already forgotten that the Σ, which had been dislodged from the oblique cases, belonged to the base.

503. If we start from the view, that the α and ι of denominatives in αζω and ιζω belong to the verbal derivative, then they correspond to the Sanskrit tenth class (§. 109*. 6.), which likewise forms denominatives; and thus, in the second person plural, αζε-τε would = Sanskrit aya-thu. The ι of ιζω would consequently be, in πολεμίζω, not the weakening of the o of ΠΟΛΕΜΟ, and in γαστρίζω, μακαρίζω, ἐαδαιμονίζω, and others, not a conjunctive vowel, but the weakened form of the old a of σχαμι ayā-mi, σχαμί ayā-si, &c.; but the vowels of the nominal bases would be rejected, as in Sanskrit in which language, in polysyllabic bases, not only the final vowels are withdrawn, but final consonants also, together with the vowel preceding them; e.g. prīt-a-γάμι from prītī, "joy," varm-ayāmi from varman, "armour." We might consider in this light the isolated word ἀεκατόμενος in Greek, and, moreover, forms like ὄνομάζω, ἄσπιζω; thus pro-
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perly, ἀεκ(οντ)-αζόμενος, ἀσπ(ιδ)-ιζω, ὄνομ(ατ)άζω: on the other hand, the majority of bases terminating with a consonant, in advantageous contrast with the Sanskrit, preserve the primary word unabbreviated, or only so weakened, as before the oblique case-terminations: thus, γαστρ-ιζω like γαστρ-ός. If this second view of the matter is, as I am much inclined to think it is, the correct one, then the opposition between forms like ἀγορ'-άζω, δικ'-άζω, χειμ-άζω, on

[Γ. Ed. p. 727.] the one hand, and such as τολεμ'-ιζω, ἀφρ'--ιζω, ἀδελφ'-ιζω, ἀνθ'-ιζω,* ύψ'--ιζω, on the other, is to be settled thus, that the α of derivation is preserved by α or η (=α) of the primitive word, in order that the base and derivative part may not experience too much weakening. Moreover, in bases in ο too, the forms in άζω, and without ι preceding, are not rare, though they are kept in the back-ground by the overwhelming majority of those in ιζω; as ἵππ-άζω, λιθ-άζω, ἑργ-άζομαι, ισ-άζω, γυμν-άζω, κολ-άζω, δοκιμ-άζω, ἐτοιμ-άζω, κωμ-άζω, σηκ-άζω, συσκοτ-άζω, (together with σκοτ-ιζω) συνκ-άζω, τοξ-άζομαι. Add to this, the form in ιζω is not entirely foreign to the α declension (λυρίζο from λύρα); and what is of more importance, both άζω and ιζω occur beyond the nominal formations, as ῥιπτ-άζω from ῥιπτω, στεν-άζω from στένω,† as δαμάζω together with δαμάω, ἀγαπάζω with ἀγαπάω, προκαλίζω with καλέω, αἰτίζω with αἰτέω, ὁθίζω with ὀθέω. Such forms are certainly connected with the character σμ aya of the tenth class.

504. To this class I refer, also, verbs in αω and εω,‡ whose

* Not from the nominative ἄθηδης, but from the base 'ΑΗΔΕΣ (compare p. 327 G. ed.).
† Ἐρπ-ύζω from ἑρπω appears to have been formed by weakening the α to ν.
‡ Of course with the exception of those the ε or α of which is radical. Denominatives in ωω, likewise, probably belong to this class, though the ο has the appearance of belonging to the primitive noun. The question appears
relation to the Sanskrit aya must be this, that (as in the Latin first conjugation and the Gothic second weak form), after dropping the semi-vowel, the two a of य य aya have combined into a corresponding long vowel (a or η). This shews itself elsewhere besides in the special tenses, e.g. in φιλ-ή-σω, πεφιλ-η-κα, with which the [G. Ed. p. 728.] Æolic present φιλ-η-μι agrees; whence, by adding the conjunctive vowel of the ω conjugation, through which the η is abbreviated, come φιλέω, φιλέομεν. The case is exactly similar to the formation of τίθεω, for τίθημι, from the root ΘΗ.* For νικάω we should expect νικ-α-μι, and such forms must have formerly existed: the νικ-η-μι,† however, which has been transmitted to us, like νικ-ή-σω for νικ-α-σω, need not surprise us, as η, according to its origin, stands everywhere for α, and even the Doric, disposed as it is to adopt the α, has not preserved every α from being corrupted to η. The Prākrit, as has been already observed, has, for the most part, contracted the character aya into ę—by suppressing the final a, vocalizing the y to i, and combining it, according to rule, with the preceding a to ę‡—and thus it appears to have one issue with that, whether the a or ε of αξω, ωξω, belong to the verbal derivative or to the nominal base.

* From the point of view of the Greek it might appear doubtful whether ϊοτάμι, τίθημι, δίδομι, should be regarded as lengthened forms, or ϊοτάμεν, τίθεμεν, δίδομεν, as shortened ones. But the history of language is in favor of the latter opinion (compare §. 481.).

† I formerly thought it probable, that in νικαω the Sanskrit preposition ni might be concealed, then κα would be the root, and might be compared with जयामि jay-ā-mi, “I conquer,” from ji, Cl. 1., the medial being irregularly raised to a tenuis. But if, which I now prefer, νικ is regarded as the root, and ὀμ = ayāmi, is the class character; then νικαω leads us to the Sanskrit causal nās-ayā-mi, “to annihilate,” “to slay.” The relation of νικ to nās resembles that of kri-ṇi-mas to kṛi-ṇā-mi, in Sanskrit (§. 485.). Then the conquering would take its name from the annihilation of the foe combined with it, and νικαω would also be akin to νέκυς, νεκρός.

answers to the Latin second, and Gothic third conjugation of the weak form (p. 110, passim). But in Prākrit the y of aya may also be abandoned, as jan-aa-di = Sanskrit jan-aya-ti,

[ G. Ed. p. 729.] which serves as countertype to the Latin first and Gothic second weak conjugation (with 0 for ə, according to §. 69.), and to Greek verbs with the derivative η or ἀ.

505. The relation of the Latin i of the fourth conjugation to the Sanskrit aya is to be viewed thus, that the first a has been weakened to i, and has then combined with the y dissolved to i, which follows, into i, and this i before a vowel following-sound is again subjected to abbreviation. The final a of चय aya has been lost or preserved under the same circumstances as those under which the syllable य ya of the fourth class; e.g. in capio; is retained or lost (compare §. 500.). Thus the io, iunt, of audio, audiunt, correspond with the Sanskrit ayā-mi, aya-nti; e.g. in chör-ayā-mi, "I steal" (compare furō, according to §. 14.), chör-aya-nti; the īs, īds, of audēs, audīds, with the Sanskrit चयेस ayēs in chör-ayē-s, "thou mayest steal"; on the other hand, the īs, īt, īmus, ītis, of auditēs, auditēt, auditēmus, auditētis, answer to the aya-si, aya-ti, ayā-mas, aya-tha, of chör-aya-si, &c. In *Scelavonic, Dobrowsky's third conjugation is to be referred to this place, which, in the present, contrasts yū (from yo-m, §. 255. e.), ya-ty, with the Sanskrit ayā-mi, aya-nti, and Latin io, iu-nt, but in the other persons has preserved only the semi-vowel of the Sanskrit aya, resolved to i. Exclusive of the special tenses, these verbs separate into two classes (E and F, according to Dobrowsky), since the Sanskrit चय ay,† shews itself either in the form of य ye, or as i. The former, according to §. 255. e, corresponds exactly with the Prākrit र e, and

* Cf. § 741. p. 992.
† The final a of चय aya remains only in the special tenses (§. 109. 0.)
therefore with the Latin ē of the second conjugation, and with
the Gothic ai, Old High German ē, of the third weak con-
jugation (p. 120, passim); e. g. видѣ́ти  ви́д-йе-ти, "to see,"*
answering to the Prâkrit вѣ́д-ѣ́-тун (вѣ́д-ѣ́- [G. Ed. p. 730.]
-mi), Latin вѣ́д-ѣ́-ре, Sanskrit вѣ́д-ая-і-там (вѣ́д-ая́-мі). On
the other hand, буд-і-ти, "to waken," in analogy with буд-і-ші,
"thou wakenest," &c.

506. In Lithuanian we recognise the Sanskrit tenth
class, and therefore the German weak conjugation, in
Mielke's† second and third conjugation. The second, with
regard to the present, distributes itself into two classes, of
which the one, and the more numerous, has preserved
only one a of the character aya—probably the latter,—and
hence appears identical with the first, which corresponds
to the Sanskrit first or sixth class; e. g. стѣ́н-а-мѣ, "we
groan," стѣ́н-а-те, "ye groan"= Sanskrit стан-аяд-мас,‡
стан-ая-ъ-тха, as вѣ́з-а-мѣ, вѣ́з-а-лѣ́=вах-д-мас, вах-а-тха.
The other, and less numerous class, has, like Dobrowsky's
third conjugation, an і in the present, as a remnant of the
Sanskrit aya, e. g. мѣ́л-і-мѣ, "we love." In the preterite
both classes have еypo throughout the dual and plural;
thus, e. g. second person plural, стен-ѣ́-те, мѣ́л-ѣ́-те, an-
swering to the Sanskrit астан-ая-та. The singular has,
in the first person, еяу, from ея-м (§. 438.); second
person, ейі from ея-сі; third person, еypo, without an ex-
pression for the person. Thus we see here the class
character мѣ́н aya retained more exactly than in any other

* In Slavonic and Latin the causal in question has the meaning "to
see," which is a means of making to know of a particular kind, as, in
Sanskrit, the eye, as the organ of guiding, is termed нэ́-тра and нав-ана.
† Mielke's 4th conjugation, too, belongs to the Sanskrit 10th cl., see
§. 698. Note.
‡ The Sanskrit verb expresses a louder groaning than the Lithuanian,
and signifies "to thunder"; compare tonare and Greek στρω in the sense
of the roaring of the waves of the sea.
European cognate language. The ē,* answering to the ṛ a, is perhaps produced by the re-active influence of the y, while in Zend, that semi-vowel, by its assimilative force, changes into ē the following a sound; e.g. śrāv-ayē-mi, śrāv-ayē-shi, śrāv-ayē-ti, “I speak” (“make to hear”) &c. There are some verbs in Lithuanian which, in the present also, [G. Ed. p. 731.] have preserved the character सय aya in the most perfect form; e.g. klyd-ēyu,† “I wander about,” plural klyd-ēya-me, preterite singular klyd-ēya-u. Verbs, also, in oyu, ēyu, and iyu—plural oya-me, ēya-me, iya-me—furnish an exact counterpart to the Sanskrit tenth class, or causal form; e.g. dum-oyu, “I think,” plural dum-oya-me, preterite dum-oya-u; waź-ūyu, “I drive,” plural waź-ūya-me= the Sanskrit causal vāh-ayā-mas. Verbs in iyu are, as it appears, all denominatives; † e.g. dāwadiyu, “I bring into order,” from dawādas, “order.” Mielke’s third conjugation, like the preponderating class of the second conjugation, has, in the present, preserved only the last vowel of the character सय aya, and that in the form of an o, with the exception of the first and second person singular, in which the old a remains. Compare penū, “I nourish,” of the second conjugation, with laikau (laik-a-u), “I stop,” of the third.

* The Lithuanian grammarians do not write the e with a circumflex, but with a different mark to denote the length of quantity.

† Lithuanian y = Խ; and thus from the root of this verb comes the substantive klaidūnas, false believer,” with Vṛddhi (§. 26.), for Lithuanian ai = ai, the i being slightly pronounced; so baimė, “fear,” answering to the Sanskrit root bhī, “to fear,” whence bhīma, “fearful,” and hence the derivative bhāima. The derivative suffix ēnu, in klai-dāna-s, corresponds to the Sanskrit middle participial suffix āna (compare § 255. h.).

† Mielke refers verbs in ēyu, oyu, ēyu, and iyu, to his first conjugation, which is altogether composed of very heterogeneous parts.
DIVISION OF CONJUGATIONS.

SINGULAR.

pen-ù, laik-a-u.  pén-a-wa, laik-o-wa.
pen-ì, laik-a-i, pén-a-ta, laik-o-ta.
pén-a, laik-o.  pén-a, laik-o.

PLURAL.

pén-a-me, laik-o-me,
pén-a-te, laik-o-te,
pén-a, laik-o.

he two plural numbers, and in the third [G. Ed. p. 732.] son singular of the preterite, laikau has lost the syllable of the êyo, which, in the second conjugation, corresponds he Sanskrit aya, and, in the first and second person singular, it has lost the ê: it uses iau for êyau, and for êyei. Hence we see clearly enough that this con- 
tion, though more corrupted, likewise belongs to the skrit tenth class. Compare—

SINGULAR.

pen-êya-u, laik-ia-u,  pen-êyo-wa, laik-ê-wa,
pen-êye-i, laik-ie-i,  pen-êyo-ta, laik-ê-ta,
pen-êyo, laik-ê.  pen-êyo, laik-ê.

PLURAL.

pen-êyo-me, laik-ê-me,
pen-êyo-te, laik-ê-te,
pen-êyo, laik-ê.

has been already observed with regard to the Sanskrit class, that its characteristic  spent the special tenses (§. 109°. 6.), but that, with few excep-
s, it extends to all the other formations of the root, 
laying aside the final a of aya. Thus, in Lithuanian, art of the corresponding êyo, iyo, &c., is transferred to general tenses and the other formations of the word. êyo, the ê remains; of iyo, i; and of oya, ùya, ô: the d conjugation, however, uses y (=i); e.g. future pen-
u, da-wad-i-su, waž-o-su, laik-y-su.
The following Note formed the Preface to the Fourth Part of the German Edition, and, being too important to be omitted, is inserted in the present form, in order to avoid an interruption of the text.

This Part contains a section of the Comparative Grammar, the most important fundamental principles of which were published twenty-six years ago in my Conjugation System of the Sanskrit, Greek, Latin, Persian, and German, and have, since then, been almost universally acknowledged as just. No one, perhaps, now doubts any longer regarding the original identity of the abovementioned languages, with which, in the present work, are associated also the Lithuanian and Slavonic; while, since the appearance of the Third Part, I have devoted a distinct Treatise to the Celtic language,* and have endeavoured, in a Work which has recently appeared, to prove an original relationship between the Malay-Polynesian idioms, also, and the Sanskrit stem. But even so early as in my System of Conjugation, the establishment of a connection of languages was not so much a final object with me, as the means of penetrating into the secrets of lingual development, since languages, which were originally one, but during thousands of years have been guided by their own individual destiny, mutually clear up and complete one another, inasmuch as one in this place, another in that, has preserved the original organization in a more healthy and sound condition. A principal result of the inquiry instituted in my Conjugation System was the following:—that many grammatical forms, in the system of conjugation, are explained by auxiliary verbs, which are supposed to have attached themselves to them, and which, in some measure, give to the individual languages a peculiar appearance, and seem to confirm the idea, that new grammatical forms were developed, in the later periods of the history of languages, from newly-created matter; while, on closer inspection,

* In the Transactions of the Phil. Historical Cl. of the Academy of Belles Lettres for the year 1836. The separate Edition of my Treatise is out of print, and a new Edition will be struck off hereafter, to complete this Comparative Grammar.
of time, past or future, has a sonant representative. Hence, in Sanskrit and its cognate languages, there occurs, we find nothing in their possession but what they had from the first, though at times its application is new. Thus the Latin, in comparison with the Greek, which is so closely allied to it, shews, in the forms of its tenses and moods in \textit{bam, bo, vi, rem, and rim}, an aspect which is completely strange. These terminations, however, as has been long since shewn, are nothing else than the primitive roots of the verb “to be,” common to all the members of the Indo-European family of languages, and of which one has for its radical consonant a labial, the other a sibilant which is easily converted into r: it is, therefore, not surprising, that \textit{bam} presents a great resemblance to the Sanskrit \textit{abhavam} and Lithuanian \textit{buvaŭ}, “I was” (see §.522.); while forms like \textit{amabo}, through their final portion, stand in remarkable agreement with the Anglo-Saxon \textit{beo}, and Carniolan \textit{böm}, “I shall be” (see §.662., &c.), and border on the Irish dialect of the Celtic in this respect, that here also the labial root of “to be” forms an elementary part of verbs implying futurity (see §.256.).

In the Latin subjunctives, as \textit{amus, ames,} and futures, as \textit{legam, legēs, I have already, through the medium of the Sanskrit, perceived an analogy with the Greek optatives and German subjunctives, and designated, as exponent of the relation of mood or time, an auxiliary verb, which signifies “to wish,” “to will,” and the root of which is, in Sanskrit, \textit{i}, which here, as in Latin and Old High German, is contracted with a preceding \textit{a} to \textit{ê}, but in Greek, with the \textit{a} which is corrupted to \textit{o}, forms the diphthong \textit{ot}. Thus we meet with the Sanskrit \textit{bharēs}, the Old High German \textit{bērēs}, the Latin \textit{ferēs}, the Gothic \textit{hairais}, the Zend \textit{barōs}, and the Greek \textit{φερως}, as forms radically and inflexionally connected, which excite real surprise by the wonderful fidelity with which the original type has been preserved in so many languages which have been, from time immemorial, distinct from one another. On the whole, the mood, which, in §§.672.713., I have largely discussed, may be regarded as one of the lustrous points of the common grammar of the members of the Indo-European languages. All the idioms of this giant family of languages, as far as they are collected in this book, share therein under different names. In Sclovonic, Lithuanian, Lettish, and Old Prussian, it is the imperative in which we re-discover the mood called, in Sanskrit grammar, the potential and precative; and it is most remarkable how closely the Carniolan, as spoken at this day, approximates, in this point, to the Sanskrit, which has so long been a dead
in the present, only the combination of the personal terminations, and, indeed, of the primary ones, with the root, or,

language. In order to set this in a clear point of view, I have, at §. 711. (last example), contrasted two verbs of the same signification in the two languages, and in them written the Sanskrit diphthong ē from aē according to its etymological value.

Where differences exist in the languages here discussed, they frequently rest on universal euphonic laws, and therefore cease to be differences. Thus, in the paradigm just mentioned, the Carniolan has lost, in the three persons singular of the imperative, the personal termination, while the dual and plural stand in the most perfect accordance with the Sanskrit. The abbreviation in the singular, however, rests on the euphonic law which has compelled the Slavonic languages, at least in polysyllabic words, to drop all original final consonants (see §. 255. l.). According to this principle, in Carniolan, dēj (=dāi), thrice repeated, corresponds to the Latin dem, dés, det (from dāim, dais, dait), while in the present dām is more full than do, and dāish as full as das, because, that is to say, in the present the pronominal consonants originally had an i after them.*

The German languages have renounced the association of the roots of the verb "to be." They are wanting in futures like the Sanskrit dā- syāmi, Greek δώ-σω, and Lithuanian dū-su, and also in those with the labial root of "to be," which furnish the Latin dabō, and Irish futures like meal-fa-mar, "we will deceive," and Lithuanian subjunctives as dātum-bime, daremus (see §. 685.). German is wanting, too, in preterites like the Sanskrit adīk-šam, Greek ἐθικ-σα, and Latin dic-si (see §. 555.); to which belong the Slavonic tenses like da-ch, "I gave," duochom, "we gave," the guttural of which we have derived from a sibilant.† On the other hand, the German idioms, by annexing an auxiliary verb signifying "to do," have gained the appearance of a new inflexion. In this sense I have already, in my System of Conjugation, taken the Gothic plurals like sókidādum and subjunctives as sókidōyau ("I would do seek"); and subsequently, in agreement with J. Grimm, I have extended the auxiliary verb just mentioned also to the singular indicative sókida, and our forms like suchte. (See §§. 620. &c.) I think, too, I have discovered the same auxiliary in the Slavonic future būdā, "I will be" ("I do be"), and in the

* Sanskrit dādāmi, dādāsi, dādāti, on which the Carniolan dām (for dadm), dā-sh, dā, is based, see p. 673.
† See §. 255. m., &c.
stead of the root, such an extension of it, as, in the social tenses, falls to the class of conjugation, to which

operative būdi (properly "do be"); moreover, in idā, "I go" (see §. 633.); and finally, in the Greek passive aorists in θην (§. 680.); for the auxiliary verb to which our thun answers, which has been treated of minutely at §. 428, &c., signifies, both in Sanskrit I Zend, "to place," and "to make"; and the Old Saxon ēdā, "I ́l," resembles surprisingly the Zend reduplicated preterite dadha (see §. 339.). It is, however, remarkable, that those Sanskrit classes of verbs, which, as I think, I have proved our weak conjugation answers, always paraphrase that preterite which is the foundation of our German tense (reduplicated or perfect), either by an auxiliary verb signifying "to," "to make," or by a verb substantive. Here, therefore, as in so many other things, the apparently peculiar direction which the German languages have taken, was in a great measure pointed out to them by their old Asiatic sister.

I cannot, however, express myself with sufficient strength in guarding against the misapprehension of supposing that I wish to accord to the Sanskrit universally the distinction of having preserved its original character: I have, on the contrary, often noticed, in the earlier portions of this work, and also in my System of Conjugation, and in the Annals of Oriental Literature for the year 1820, that the Sanskrit has, in many points, experienced alterations where one or other of the European sister idioms are more truly transmitted to us the original form. Thus it is undoubtedly in accordance with a true retention of the original condition of the language that the Lithuanian dievas, "God," and all similar forms, keep their nominative sign s before all following initial letters, while the Sanskrit has, which answers to the abovementioned dievas, becomes either devah, dēvō, or deva, according to the initial sound which follows, or a pause; and this phenomenon occurs in all other forms in as. The modern Lithuanian is, moreover, more primitive and perfect than the Sanskrit in this point also, that in its essi, "thou art," it has, in common with the Doric σέ, preserved the necessary double s, of which one belongs to the root, the her to the personal termination, while the Sanskrit asi has lost one: also at this point, that the forms esme "we are," este, "ye are," in common with the Greek ἐσμέν, ἐστι, have retained the radical vowel, which has been stopped in the Sanskrit smas, sthas (see §. 480.). The Latin erant and bant, ēmabont, &c., surpass the Sanskrit āsan and abhavan, "they were," as so the Greek ἢσαν and ἐφον, by retaining the t, which belongs to the
the root belongs (§ 109. 493, &c.). Compare, for the first conjugation (§ 493.), the Sanskrit वहामि vahāmi, “I drive,”

third person; and ferens and the Zend baranis are in advance of the Sanskrit bharan and Greek φέρων, by their keeping the nominative sign; as also the Lithuanian vezaus (vežas), in common with the Zend vazonis and Latin vehens, put to shame, in this respect, the Sanskrit vahan. It is, in fact, remarkable that several languages, which are still spoken, retain here and there the forms of the primitive world of languages, which several of their older sisters have lost thousands of years ago. The superiority of the Carniolan dám to the Latin do has been mentioned before; but all other Carniolan verbs have the same superiority over all other Latin verbs, with the exception of sum and inquam, as also over the Greek verbs, as the Carniolan, and, in common with it, the Irish, have in all forms of the present preserved the chief element of the original termination mi. It is, too, a phenomenon in the history of languages, which should be specially noticed, that among the Indian daughters of the Sanskrit, as in general among its living Asiatic and Polynesian relations, not one language can, in respect of grammatical Sanskrit analogies, compare with the more perfect idioms of our quarter of the globe. The Persian has, indeed, retained the old personal terminations with tolerable accuracy, but, in disadvantageous comparison with the Lithuanian and Carniolan, has lost the dual, and preserved scarce any thing of the ancient manner of formation of the tenses and moods; and the old case terminations, which remain almost entire in the Lithuanian, and of which the Classical and German languages retain a great part, the Celtic somewhat, have completely vanished in Persian, only that its plurals in án bear the same resemblance to the Sanskrit plural accusatives, that the Spanish in os and as do to the Latin; and also the neuter plurals in há, as I believe I have shewn, stand connected with the old system of declension (see § 241.). And in the correct retention of individual words the Persian is often far behind the European sisters of the Sanskrit; for while in expressing the number “three” the European languages, as far as they belong to the Sanskrit, have all preserved both the T sound (as t, th, or d) and also the r, the Persian sīh is farther removed from the ancient form than the Tahitic toru (euphonic for tru). The Persian čehār or čhār, “four,” also, is inferior to the Lithuanian keturi, Russian četyre, Gothic fidvēr, Welsh pedwar, and even to the e-fatrā of Madagascar.

No one will dispute the relation of the Bengáli to the Sanskrit; but it
“I carry,” with the verbs which correspond to it in the cognate idioms. (Regarding ἕχω, and the Lithuanian wėžti, see § 442. Note ⁹ and ⁴).

has completely altered the grammatical system, and thus, in this respect, resembles the Sanskrit infinitely less than the majority of European languages. And as regards the lexicon, too, the Bengali resembles the above-mentioned language far less than its European sisters, in such words, for instance, as have gone through the process of fermentation in a language which has newly arisen from the ruins of an old one, and have not been re-drawn from the Sanskrit at a comparatively recent period, without the slightest alteration, or only with a trifling modification in their pronunciation. We will take as an example the word Schwester, “sister”; this German word resembles the Sanskrit swasdr* far more than the Bengali bohini;† Bruder, also, is more like the Sanskrit bhrātar than the effeminate Bengali bārā; and Tochter is infinitely closer to the Sanskrit duhitar than the Bengali jhi. The German words Vater and Mutter correspond far better to the Sanskrit pitar (from patar) and mātar than the Bengali bap or babaṭ, and mā. The German numerals drei, acht, and neun, are more similar to the Sanskrit tri, ashtān (from aktān), navan, than the Bengali tin, at, nay. And while sieben has retained only the labial of the pt of the Sanskrit saptan; the Bengali sāt has only the T sound, and has dropped entirely the termination an. In general it appears that, in warm regions, languages, when they have once burst the old grammatical chain, hasten to their downfall with a far more rapid step than under our milder European sun. But if the Bengali and other new Indian idioms have really laid aside their old grammatical dress, and partly put on a new one, and in their forms of words experienced mutilation almost everywhere, in the beginning, or in the middle, or at the end, no one need object if I assert the same of the Malay-Polynesian languages, and refer them to the San-

* This, and not swaṛi, is the true theme; the nominative is swaṛd, the accusative swaṛdrm. This word, as Pott also conjectures, has lost, after the second s, a t, which has been retained in several European languages.

† The initial s is rejected, and the second corrupted to h. The Sanskrit v is, in Bengali, regularly pronounced as b, and a like o. As regards the termination ini, I look upon the i as an interposed conjunctive vowel, and the n as a corruption of r, as in the numeral tin, “three.” Properly speaking, bohini presupposes a Sanskrit swaṛi (from swa-ṛi).

‡ In my opinion, a reduplication of the initial syllable pa.
skrit family, because I have found in them a pervading relationship in numerals and pronouns, and, moreover, in a considerable number of other common words.*

Philology would ill perform its office if it accorded an original identity only to those idioms in which the mutual points of resemblance appear everywhere palpable and striking, as, for instance, between the Sanskrit *dadami*, the Greek *diəmou*, Lithuanian *dâmi*, and Old Scatonic *damy*. Most European languages, in fact, do not need proof of their relationship to the Sanskrit; for they themselves shew it by their forms, which, in part, are but very little changed. But that which remained for philology to do, and which I have endeavoured to the utmost of my ability to effect, was to trace, on one hand, the resemblances into the most retired corner of the construction of language, and, on the other hand, as far as possible, to refer the greater or less discrepancies to laws through which they became possible or necessary. It is, however, of itself evident, that there may exist languages which, in the interval of thousands of years in which they have been separated from the sources whence they arose, have, in great measure, so altered the forms of words, that it is no longer practicable to refer them to the mother dialect, if it be still existing and known. Such languages may be regarded as independent, and the people who speak them may be considered Autochthones. But where, in two languages, or families of languages, resemblances, which are perfectly

---

* See my Pamphlet "On the Connection of the Malay-Polynesian Languages with the Indo-European; as also my own notice of the same in the Ann. of Lit. Crit. (March 1842); and compare A. Dietenbach's judicious review, l. c. May 1842.
Respecting the lengthening of the class vowel [G. Ed. p. 734. see §. 434.]

1. Weżi from weż-o-m for weż-a-m, as in Old Scavonic see §. 235. g. and 436. The full Lithuanian termination is mi, and the Old Scavonic my (§ 436.). 2 See §. 448.

3. In Latin the weakening of the a of the middle syllable to i prevails nearly throughout; but, in Gothic, occurs only before s and th final: see §§. 67. 109. 4. Wessti from wez-o-m for wez-a-m, as in Old Sclavonic ve-u from ve-o-m: see §. 235. g. and 436. The Old Prussian has everywhere retained the sibilant, and employs se or seiy and 01, as the personal termination; as druwe-se, "thou believest" (compare Sanskrit dhruva, "firm," "certain"), da-se, "thou givest," wai(d)-sei, "thou knowest," giw-a-si (for giw-a-si), "thou livest,"—Sansk. jiv-a-si. 5 From viq-a-nes, see §. 441.

6. From viq-a-nes, see §. 441. 7 From ʃ-e-ros, see §. 97. 8 Is supplied by the singular. 9 Vazámahi is founded on the Vêda-form vahāmasi, see §. 439.

10. See §. 458. 11. From vez-o-nty, see §. 255. g.

* Observe the frequent coincidence in Madagasc. and Tongian with the German laws of euphony, of which more is to be found in my Pamphlet on the Malay-Polynesian Languages, p. 5 and Rem. 13.
508. In the Sanskrit first conjugation the verb तिष्ठामि tishṭhāmi, "I stand," deserves particular notice. It proceeds from the root stha, and belongs properly to the third class, which receives reduplication (§. 109*. 3.); but is distinguished from it by this anomalous character, that it shortens its radical ṁ in the special tenses,* and also

* Whereupon, naturally, in the first person, this shortened ṃ is, according to §. 434., again lengthened.

large number of words and forms, which appear to be peculiar, then we must not only detach the Malay-Polynesian languages from the Sanskrit stem, but also separate them from one another—the Madagascar and South-Sea languages from the acknowledged affinity with the Tagalia, Malay, and Javanese, which has been so methodically and skillfully demonstrated by W. von Humboldt; and in like manner divide the Latin from the Greek and Sanskrit; and the Greek, German, Scelavonic, Lettish, Lithuanian, Celtic, must be allowed to be so many independent, unconnected potentates of the lingual world; and the coincidences, which the many members of the Indo-European lingual chain mutually offer, must be declared to have originated casually or by subsequent commixture.

I believe, however, that the apparent verbal resemblances of kindred idioms, exclusive of the influences of strange languages, arise either from this, that each individual member, or each more confined circle of a great stem of languages, has, from the period of identity, preserved words and forms which have been lost by the others; or from this, that where, in a word, both form and signification have undergone considerable alteration, a sure agreement with the sister words of the kindred languages is no longer possible. That, however, the signification, as well as the form, alters in the course of time, we learn even from the comparison of the new German with the earlier conditions of our mother-language. Why should not far more considerable changes in idea have arisen in the far longer period of time which divides the European languages from the Sanskrit? I believe that every genuine radical word, whether German, Greek, or Roman, proceeds from the original matrix although the threads by which it is retraced are found by us at times cut off or invisible. For instance, in the so-called strong conjugation of the
in the syllable of reduplication, where a short a should stand, it weakens this, the gravest of the vowels, to that which is the lightest, i; hence, e.g., in the second and third person singular, *tiśṭha-si, tiśṭha-li*, for *tastḥa-si, tastḥa-li*, as might be expected according to the analogy of *dadd-si, dadd-li*. As the shortened a of *sthā* is treated in the conjugation exactly like the class vowel of the first conjugation, this verb, therefore, and *ghṛkt*, “to smell,” which follows its analogy, is included by the native grammarians in the

German one would expect nothing exclusively German, but only what has been handed down and transmitted from the primitive source. We are able, however, to connect with certainty but very few roots of the strong verbs with the Indian. While, e.g., the Sanskrit, Zend, Greek, Latin, Lithuanian, Lettish, and Slavonic, agree in the idea of “giving” in a root, of which the original form, preserved in the Sanskrit and Zend, is *dā*, the German *gab* throws us into perplexity as regards its comparison with its sisters. But if we would assume that this verb originally signified “to take,” and has received the causal meaning (“to make to take,” i.e. “to give”), as the Sanskrit *tiśṭhāmi*, and Zend *histāmi*, Greek ἵστημι, has arrived, from the meaning of “standing,” at that of “taking”: we might then trace *gab* to the Vēda *grabh*, and assume that the r has been lost, although this root has remained in German also, in a truer form and meaning, only that the a has been weakened to i (Gothic *greipja, graip, grippum*).

I have altered the plan proposed in the Preface to the First Part (p. xvii.), of devoting a separate work to the formation of words and comparison of them, and to refer thither also the participles, conjunctions, and prepositions, for this reason, that I intend to treat in the present work, with all possible conciseness, the comparative doctrine of the formation of words, and will also discuss the coincidences of the various members of the Indo-European stem of languages, which appear in the conjunctions and prepositions. For this object a Fifth Number will be requisite. The present Fourth Number will conclude the formation of the tenses and moods; but a little remains to be added regarding the mood which is called *Lēt* in the Zend and Vēda-dialects, as also the imperative, which, for the rest, is distinguished only by its personal terminations, which have been already discussed in the Third Part.
first class; so that, according to them, we should have to
divide tishtʰ-a-vi, tishtʰ-a-ti, and regard tishtʰ as a substitute
for stʰa. I consider the double weakening, which the roots
stʰá and ghṛtʰ undergo in the syllable of repetition and of

[G. Ed.p. 735.] the base, to be caused by the two com-
combined consonants, which produce in the syllable of repetition a
length by position; for which reason, in order that the whole
should not appear too unwieldy, the vowel weight of the syl-
lable of reduplication, have weakened the
radical ā of stʰ-re to i, and apparently introduced the
verb into the third conjugation. I say apparently,
because the essence of the third conjugation consists in
this, that an i, which is not radical, is inserted between
the root and the personal termination; but the i of sistʰ-s,
&c., like the a of the Sanskritishta-si, belongs to the
root. The Greek ιστη-μι has so far maintained itself upon
an older footing, that it has not given to the syllable of
reduplication, or to its consonantal combination, an in-
fluence on the long vowel of the radical syllable, but
admits of the shortening of this vowel only through the
influence of the weight of the personal terminations;
thus, before the grave terminations of the plural numbers,
and of the entire middle, according to the analogy of
diδωμι, &c. (see §. 480.). With respect to the kind of
reduplication which occurs in the Sanskrit tishtʰāmī, and
of which more hereafter, I must notice preliminarily the
Latin testis, which is the reverse case of steti, if, as I be-
lieve, testis is to be regarded as one who stands for any
thing.

509. The Sanskrit, and all its cognate dialects, have two
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Roots for the verb substantive, of which the one, which is, in Sanskrit, भू, in Zend, ज़ बु, belongs to the first conjugation, and, indeed, to the first class, and assumes, therefore, in the special tenses, a class-vowel a, and [G. Ed. p. 736.] augments the radical vowel by Guna; while the other, viz. अस as, falls to the second conjugation, and, in fact, to the second class. These two roots, in all the Indo-European languages, except in the Greek, where ΦΥ has entirely lost the signification "to be," are so far mutually complete, that भु, बु, have remained perfect in the Sanskrit and Zend (as far as the latter can be quoted); but as, on the contrary, in its isolated condition, is used only in the special tenses. In Lithuanian, the root which answers to as is only used in the present indicative, and in the participle present; just as in the Slavonic, where the present of the gerund is, according to its origin, identical with the participle present. The Gothic forms from as, the a of which it weakens to i, its whole present indicative and subjunctive, only that there is attached to it a further apparent root SIΥ, which, however, in like manner, proceeds from अस as. The root भु, in Gothic, does not refer at all to the idea of "to be"; but from it proceeds, I have no doubt, the causal verb baue, "I build" (second person bauais), which I derive, like the Latin facio, from भाωयάι bhavayami, "I make to be" (§. 19.). The High German has also preserved remains of the root भु in the sense of "to be": hence proceed, in the Old High German, the first and second person of the singular and plural, while the third persons ist and sint (which latter form is now, in the shape of sind, erroneously transferred to the first person) answer to सह asti, सनि santi. Further, from अस as proceeds also the subjunctive si Sanskrit सहस्यल syām, "I may be"), and the infinitive sin. Moreover, also, the Sanskrit root vas, "to dwell," has raised itself, in German, to the dignity of the verb sub-
stantive, since, indeed, in Gothic, the present *visa* (weakened from *vasa*, see §. 109*. 1.) signifies only "to remain;" but the preterite *vas*, and its subjunctive *vészau* (German *war, wäre*), the infinitive *visan*, and the participle present *visands*, [G. Ed. p. 737.] replace the forms which have been, from ancient time, lost by the roots expressing the idea "to be." It may be proper to mention here, that in Sanskrit, the root *sthā* "to stand," occasionally receives the abstract meaning "to be," and so, as it were, has served as an example to the Roman languages, which, for their verb substantive, employ, besides the Latin roots, *ES* and *FU*, also *STA*. As, too, "to sit," occurs in Sanskrit, in the sense of the verb substantive; e.g. Nal. 16. 30. गातसम्भा इव” सते gatasattuvaḥ(स) ivā” satē, "like senseless are they;" Hitôp. 44, 11. अस्तान्त चास्तानां च सुकृतिनाम अस्ताम mānasasattuṣṭayē sukritinām, “let it be (your good behaviour) to gratify the spirit of the virtuous;” Urv. 92. 8. अयुष्मान अस्तान्त अयम् aṣṭām aṣṭam ayam, “long-lived may this man be.” It is not improbable that the verb substantive is only an abbreviation of the root *ās*, and that generally the abstract notion of "being" is in no language the original idea of any verb whatever. The abbreviation of *ās* to *as*, and from that to a simple *s*, before heavy terminations (see §. 480), is explained, however, in the verb substantive, very easily; as the consequence of its being worn out by the extremely frequent use made of it, and from the necessity for a verb, which is so much employed, and universally introduced, obtaining a light and facile build. Frequent use may, however, have a double influence on the form of a verb;—in the first place, to wear it out and simplify it as much as possible; and, secondly, to maintain in constant recollection its primitive forms of inflexion, by calling them perpetually into remembrance, and thus secure them from destruction. Both these results are seen in the verb substantive for in Latin, *sum*, together with *inquam*, are the only verbs,
which have preserved the old personal sign in the present: in the Gothic and English of the present day, *im* and *am* are the only forms of this kind; and in our New German, *bin* (from *bim*) and *sind* are the sole forms [G. Ed. p. 738.] which have preserved the character of the first person singular and third person plural.

510. As the Sanskrit root *bhu* belongs to the first conjugation, we shall next examine its conjugation in the present. As belonging to the first class, it requires Guna and the insertion of the class vowel *a* between the root and the personal termination (§. 109 a. 1.) This insertion of the *a* occasions the *bhō* (=*bhau*), for euphonic reasons, to become *bhav*, in which form the root appears in all the persons of the special tenses. By this *bhav*, in Zend *bar*, the Old High German *bir* (or *pir*), in the plural *bir-u-mēs*, *bir-u-t*, obtains very satisfactory explanation, since, as remarked at §. 20., and as has since been confirmed, in the case before us, by Graff (II. 325.), the semi-vowels are often interchanged; and, for example, *v* readily becomes *r* or *l.* The *u* of *bir-u-mēs*, *bir-u-t*, is a weakening of the old *a* (Vocalismus, p. 227. 16.); and the *i* of the radical syllable *bir* rests on the weakening of that vowel, which occurs very often elsewhere (§. 6.). The singular should, according to the analogy of the plural, be *birum*, *birus*, *birut*, but has rejected the second syllable; so that *bim* has nearly the same relation to the Sanskrit *bhavāmi*, that, in Latin, *malo* has to the *mavolo*, which was to have been looked for. The obsolete subjunctive-forms *fuam*, *fuas*, *fuat*, *fuant*, presuppose an indicative *fuo*, *fuis*, *fuit*, &c., which has certainly at one time existed, and, in essentials, has the same relation to the Sanskrit *bhavāmi*, *bhavasi*, *bhavati*, that *veho*, *vehis*, *vehit*, have to *vahāmi*, *vahasi*, *vahati.

* See, also, §. 409. Note †, and §. 447. Note ⁶.
The obsolete form *fuvi* of the perfect, which is found with the common *fui*, leads us from *fuo* to *fuvo*, in as far as the syllable *vi* of *fuvi* is not declared (to which I assent) identical with the *vi* of *amavi*, but its *v* regarded as developed from *u*, just as, in the Sanskrit reduplicated preterite बभुवः *abhuva*, in the aorist सभूषः *abhūvam*, and in the Lithuanian preterite *buwâi*.

The full conjugation of the present of the root under discussion, in Sanskrit, Zend, Old High German, and Greek, is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SINGULAR</th>
<th>ZEND</th>
<th>OLD HIGH GERMAN</th>
<th>GREEK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>संस्कृत.</td>
<td>एर्द.</td>
<td>बुड्हो.</td>
<td>ग्रीक.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bhav-à-mi,</td>
<td>bav-à-mi,</td>
<td>bi-m,</td>
<td>φυ-ω'-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bhav-a-si,</td>
<td>bav-a-hi,</td>
<td>bi-s,*</td>
<td>φυ-εi-ς.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bhav-a-ti,</td>
<td>bav-ai-ti,</td>
<td>....</td>
<td>φυ-ε-(τ)ι.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bhav-à-vas</td>
<td>....</td>
<td>....</td>
<td>....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bhav-a-thas,</td>
<td>bav-a-tho?</td>
<td>....</td>
<td>φυ-ε-τον.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bhav-a-tas,</td>
<td>bav-a-tö,</td>
<td>....</td>
<td>φυ-ε-τον.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLURAL.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bhav-à-mas,</td>
<td>bav-à-mahi</td>
<td>bir-u-mês,</td>
<td>φυ-ο-μες.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bhav-a-tha,</td>
<td>bav-a-tha,</td>
<td>bir-u-t,</td>
<td>φυ-ε-τε.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bhav-a-nti,</td>
<td>bav-ai-nti</td>
<td>....†</td>
<td>φυ-ο-ντι.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

511. I hold it to be unnecessary to further annex an example of the second conjugation (that in μ in Greek), for several examples have been given already, in the

---

* Also *bist*.

† The forms *birint*, *birent*, *birnt*, and *bint*, which occur in Notker in the second person plural, I consider as inorganic intruders from the third person, where *birint* would answer admirably to *bhavanti*. The form *bint* corresponds in its abbreviation to the singular *bim*, *bis*. With regard to the mutation of the person, notice the German *sind* of the first person.
paragraphs, which treat of the influence of the gravity of personal terminations on the preceding radical or class syllable, to which we here refer the reader (§. 480.). We will only adduce from the Gothic the verb substantive (as it is the only one which belongs to this conjugation), and contrast its present with the Sanskrit and Zend (compare p. 695 G. ed.):—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SINGULAR</th>
<th>PLURAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SANSKRIT</td>
<td>ZEND.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>as-mi,</td>
<td>ah-mi,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a-si,</td>
<td>a-hi,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>as-li,</td>
<td>as'-ti,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"Remark 1.—It is evident that the plural forms siy-u-m, siy-u-th, if strictly taken, do not belong to this place, as the personal terminations are not conjoined direct with the root; but by means of a u, which might be expected, also, in the second dual person, siy-u-ts, if it occurred, and in which respect these forms follow the analogy of the preterite. The first dual person which actually occurs is siyā.* As regards the syllable siy, on which, as root, all these forms, as well as the subjunctive siy-au, siy-ais, &c., are based, I do not think, that, according to its origin, it is to be distinguished from im (of which the radical s has been lost) and sind. To sind answers siy, in so far as it likewise has lost the radical vowel, and commences with the sibilant, which in Zend, according to §. 53., has become h. With regard to the iy, which is added, I think that siy stands connected with the Sanskrit potential sydm, so that to the semi-vowel there has been further prefixed its corresponding vowel i; for the Gothic, as it appears, does not admit of a y after an initial consonant; hence siyau for syau = स्याम sydm, according to the principle

* Regarding the derivation of this form from siy-u-va, and the ground of my giving the long u, see §. 441.
by which, from the numeral base *thri*, “three,” comes the genitive *thriye* for *thrye* (§. 310.). If, therefore, in the form *siy*, properly only the *s* is radical, and the *iy* expresses [G. Ed. p. 741.] a mood-relation, still the language, in its present state, is no longer conscious of this, and erroneously treating the whole *siy* as root, adds to it, in the subjunctive, the class vowel *a* (§. 109°. 1.), (with which a new *i* is united as the representative of the mood-relation,) and, in the indicative, the vowel *u*, which otherwise, in the preterite, regularly enters between the root and the personal termination.”

“Remark 2.—That in the Roman languages, also, the weight of the personal terminations exerts an influence on the preceding radical syllable; and that e. g., in French, the relation of *tenons* to *tiens* rests on the same principle on which, in Greek, that of διδομεν to διδωμι does, has been already elsewhere remarked.* The third person plural, in respect to the form of the radical vowel, ranks with the singular, since it, like the latter, has a lighter termination than the first and second person plural, and indeed, as pronounced in French, none at all; hence *tiennent*, contrasted with *tenons*, *tenez*. Diez, however, differing from my view of the Roman terminating sound (*Ablaut*), has, in his Grammar of the Roman languages (I. p. 168), based the vowel difference between *tiens* and *tenons* on the difference of the accent which exists, in Latin, between *teneo* and *tenemus*. But it is not to be overlooked, that, in the third conjugation also, although *quæro* and *quærimus* have the same accent, still, in Spanish, *querimos* is used, opposed to *quiero*, and, in French, *acquérons*, opposed to *acquiers*, as has been already remarked by Fuchs, in his very valuable pamphlet, “Contributions to the Examination of the Roman Lan-

---
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languages," p. 18. It may be, that the i of the French sais, is identical with the i of the Latin sapio; but, even then, the dislodgement of this i in savons rests on the same law as that which dislodged, in tenons, the i prefixed in tiens; as, e.g., in Sanskrit, the root vəś rejects, in the same places, its radical a, where regular verbs of the same class lay aside the Guna vowel which is introduced into the root before light terminations; thus, उस्मस् उस्मस, "we will," opposed to वस्म वस्मि, "I will," as, in French, savons to sais."

"Remark 3.—I cannot ascribe to the Guna in the conjugation of the Sanskrit and its cognate languages a grammatical meaning, but explain it as proceeding sim- [G. Ed. p. 742.] ply from a disposition to fulness of form, which occasions the strengthening of the lighter vowels i and u, by, as it were, taking them under the arm by prefixing an a, while the a itself, as it is the heaviest vowel, does not require extraneous help. If it were desired, with Pott (Etym. Inq. I. 60.), to find, in the Guna of the present and imperfect, an expression of the continuance of an action, we should be placed in the same difficulty with him, by the circumstance that the Guna is not restricted to these two tenses, but, in verbs with the lighter base-vowels i and u, accompanies the root through nearly all the tenses and moods, not only in Sanskrit, but also in its European cognate languages, in as far as these have in general preserved this kind of diphthongization; as the Greek λείπω and φεύ-γω cannot any more be divested of the e taken into the roots ΆΠΠ, ΦΥΓ, only that the e in λέοιτα is replaced by o;* and that the aorists ἐλιπον, ἐφυγον, exhibit the pure root, which I cannot attribute to the signification of this aorist (as the second aorist has the same meaning as the first, but the latter firmly retains the Guna, if it is especially the property of the verb), but to the circumstance that the

* E and o, never a are, with the vowel ι, the representatives of the Sanskrit Guna vowel a, see Vocalismus, pp. 7, 193, passim.
second aorist is for the most part prone to retain the original form of the root, and hence at one time exhibits a lighter vocalization than the other tenses, at another, a heavier one; as ἔτραπων compared with ἔτρεψα and ἔτρεπον. In this disposition, therefore, of the second aorist to retain the true state of the root, the difference between forms like ἐλιπων, ἔφυγων, ἔτυχον, and the imperfects of the corresponding verbs, cannot be sought in the circumstance, that the action in the aorist is not represented as one of duration; and that, on the contrary, in the imperfect and present the continuance is symbolically represented by the Guna. On the whole, I do not think that the language feels a necessity to express formally the continuance of an action, because it is self-evident that every action and every sort of repose requires time, and that it is not the business of a moment, if I say that any one eats or drinks, sleeps or sits, or that he ate or drank, slept or sat, at the time that this or that action occurred regarding which I affirm the past time. I cannot, therefore, assume, with Pott, that the circumstance that the class-characteristics oc-

[G. Ed. p. 743.] cur only in the special tenses (i.e. in the present and imperfect indicative, and in the moods thereto belonging), is to be thence explained, that here a continuance is to be expressed. Why should the Sanskrit have invented nine different forms as symbols of continuance, and, among its ten classes of conjugations (see §. 109*), exhibit one, also, which is devoid of all foreign addition? I believe, rather, that the class affixes originally extended over all tenses, but subsequently, yet still before the separation of languages, were dislodged from certain tenses, the build of which induced their being laid aside. This inducement occurred in the aorist (the first, which is most frequently used) and future, owing to the annexation of the verb substantive; where-
therefore, δασύαμι and δῶσω were used for δαδασύαμι and διδώσω; and in the perfect, owing to the reduplication characterising this tense, whence, in Greek, the form δέ-
δειγματί must have gained the preference over the δεδείκνυμαι
which may have existed. Observe that, in Sanskrit, the loading the root, by reduplication, in the tenses mentioned, has occasioned, even in the second person plural active, the loss of the personal sign; so that दद्रिश दद्रिशा corresponds to the Greek ἰδεόρκ-α-τε.”

512. For the description of the present middle, which, in the Greek, appears also as the passive, and in Gothic as passive alone, it is sufficient to refer back to the disquisition on the middle terminations given at §. 466. &c. It might, however, not be superfluous once more to contrast here, as an example of the first conjugation, the Sanskrit bharê (for bhar-ā-mē) with the corresponding forms of the cognate languages; and, for the second conjugation, to annex the forms of the Sanskrit tan-w-ē (from tan-u-mē, from tan, Cl. 8., “to extend,” see §. 109°. 4.), and Greek τάνυμα.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SANSKRIT.</th>
<th>ZEND.</th>
<th>GREEK.</th>
<th>GOTHIC.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>bhar-ē (from bhar-ā-mē)</td>
<td></td>
<td>φέρ-ο-μαυ</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bhar-a-se,</td>
<td>bar-a-hē,</td>
<td>(φέρ-ε-σαι)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bhar-a-tē,</td>
<td>bar-ai-tē,</td>
<td>φέρ-ε-ταί</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SANSKRIT.</th>
<th>ZEND.</th>
<th>GREEK.</th>
<th>GOTHIC.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>bhar-ā-vuhē,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bhar-ēthē,</td>
<td></td>
<td>φέρ-ε-σθων</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bhar-ēthē,</td>
<td></td>
<td>φέρ-ε-σθων</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SANSKRIT.</th>
<th>ZEND.</th>
<th>GREEK.</th>
<th>GOTHIC.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>bhar-ā-mahē,</td>
<td>bar-ā-maidhē, φέρ-ό-μεθα</td>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bhar-a-dhwē,</td>
<td>bar-a-dhwē ? φέρ-ε-σθε</td>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bhar-a-nṭē,</td>
<td>bar-ai-nṭē, φέρ-ο-νταί</td>
<td>bair-a-nda.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 See §§. 467. 473. 2 Regarding the ai of the root, see §. 41.; and as to the Gothic ai of bairaza, &c., see §. 82. 3 This is replaced by the third person. 4 The terminations, za, da, nda, are abbreviations of zai, dai, ndai, see §. 466. Observe, in bair-a-za, bair-a-da, that the conjunctive vowel is preserved in its original form (see §. 466. conclusion). 5 Bharēthē and bharētē, from bhar-ā-āthē, bhar-ā-ātē, whence bharāthē, bharātē, would be regular; but in this place, throughout the whole first conjugation, the ā has been weakened to ē ( = a + i), or
the of the termination has become i or ï, and been melted down with the class vowel a to e. Regarding the terminations áthê, átê, as conjectural abbreviations of tâthê, tâtê, or såthê, såtê, see §§ 474. 475. 6 See §§ 474. 475. 7 From bhar-â-madhê, see § 472. To the Zend termination maidhê the Irish termination maoid remarkably corresponds; e.g. in dagh-a-maoid, “we burn” = Sanskrit dah-â-mahê, from dah-â-madhê. 8 Probably from bhar-a-ddhwê, see §§ 474. 475. 9 The termination ðhwê may be deduced with tolerable certainty from the secondary form dhwem; see Burnouf’s Yâna, Notes, p. xxxviii.

SINGULAR.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sanskrit</th>
<th>Greek</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>tan-w-ê (from tan-u-mê)</td>
<td>tâv-v-µâi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tan-u-šê</td>
<td>tâv-v-σâi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tan-u-âê</td>
<td>tâv-v-τâi.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DUAL.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sanskrit</th>
<th>Greek</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>tan-u-vâhê</td>
<td>tâv-û-µêbôv.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tan-w-âthê</td>
<td>tâv-v-σbôv.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tan-w-âtê</td>
<td>tâv-v-σbôv.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PLURAL.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sanskrit</th>
<th>Greek</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>tan-u-mahê from tan-u-madhê</td>
<td>tâv-û-µêbôâ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tan-u-dhwê</td>
<td>tâv-v-σbê.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tan-w-âtê from tan-w-antê*</td>
<td>tâv-v-ντâi.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“Remark.—In Zend, we expect, if tan is here employed, according to the same class of conjugation, for the second and third person singular, and first and second person plural, the forms tan-ûi-êlê (see §§ 41. 52.), tan-ûi-îlê (according to the kêrê-nûi-îlê, ‘he makes,’ which actually occurs), tan-u-maidhê, tan-u-dhwê. The third person plural might be tan-w-aîtê, or tan-w-aïntê, according as the nasal is rejected or not; for that the Zend, also, admits of the rejection of the nasal in places where this is the case in Sanskrit, is proved by the forms sênhaiti, ‘they teach,’ middle sênhaitê, corre-

* See §§ 458. 459. See an example of the active of the corresponding class of conjugation, or one nearly akin to it, at p. 706 G. ed.
spending to the Sanskrit शासति šasati, शाश्ते šasate (Burnouf, Yaçna, p. 480). In the Sanskrit, also, we sometimes find the nasal retained in the middle of the second conjugation, e.g., achinwanta for the more common achinwata. In the first person singular, the form tan-uy-े, with euphonic ɨ, is formed, in Zend, as appears from § 43.

THE PRETERITE.

513. The Sanskrit has for the expression of past time the forms of the Greek imperfect, aorist, and perfect, without, however, like the Greek, connecting with these different forms degrees of meaning. They are, in Sanskrit, all, without distinction, used in the sense of the [G. Ed. p. 746.] Greek aorist or imperfect; but the reduplicated preterite, which corresponds in form to the Greek perfect, most frequently represents the aorist. The Sanskrit is entirely deficient in a tense exclusively intended to express the completion of an action: none of the three forms mentioned is used chiefly for this object; and I do not remember that I have anywhere found the reduplicated preterite as representative of the perfect. When the completion of an action is to be expressed, we most commonly find the active expression changed into a passive one; and, in fact, so that a participle which, in form and signification, corresponds to the Latin in tuus, is combined with the present of the verb substantive, or the latter is to be supplied, as in general the verb substantive, in Sanskrit, is omitted almost everywhere, where it can possibly be done. Some examples may appear not improperly annexed here. In the episode of the Savitri it should be said V.19. “So far as was to go, hast thou gone,” where the last words are expressed by gatan twayā (gatan

* I have published it in a collection of episodes entitled “Diluvium,” &c., in the original text, and in the German translation under the title “Sündflut.” (Berlin, F. Dümmler.)
euphonic for *gatam*), "gone by thee": in the Nalus XII. 29., for "Hast thou seen Nala"? we read in the original *kachchit drishtas twayā Nalô, i.e. "an visus a te Nalus"? in Kālidāsa's *Urvasī* (ed. Lenz, p. 66) "Hast thou stolen her step"? is expressed by *gatir asyās twayā hritā ("the way of her taken by thee"). It happens, too, not unfrequently, that the completion of an action is denoted in such a manner that he who

[G. Ed. p. 747.] has performed an action is designated as the possessor of what has been done; since *e.g.* उक्तवान् अस्मि *uktavān asmi*, literally "dicto praeitis sum," signifies "dictum habeo," "I have said." Thus in *Urvasī* (l. c. p. 73) the question, "Hast thou seen my beloved"? is expressed by *api dṛśhtavān asi mama priyām, i.e. "art thou having seen m. b."?

* The modern mode, therefore, of expressing the completion of an action was, in a measure, prepared by the Sanskrit; for the suffix *vat* (in the strong cases *vant*) forms possessives; and I consider it superfluous to assume, with the Indian grammarians, a primitive suffix *tavat* for active perfect participles. It admits of no doubt whatever, that उक्तवान् *uktavat* "having said," has arisen from *ukta" said," in the same way as धनवत् *dhanavat*, "having riches," "rich," proceeds from *dhana*, "riches."† The form in *tavat*,

* The fourth act of Urvasī affords very frequent occasion for the use of the perfect, as the King Pururavas on all sides directs the question whether any one has seen his beloved? This question, however, is never put by using an augmented or even a reduplicated preterite, but always by the passive participle, or the formation in *vat* derived from it. So, also, in Nalus, when Damayanti asks if any one has seen her spouse?

† The Latin *di vit* may be regarded as identical with *dhanavat*, the middle syllable being dropped and compensated for by lengthening the preceding vowel. A similar rejection of a syllable has again occurred in *ditior*, *ditissimus*, just as in *malo*, from *mavolo*, from *magisvolo*. Pott, on the contrary, divides thus, *div-it*, and thus brings "the rich" to the Indian "heaven," *div*, to which also Varro's derivation of *divus* in a certain degree alludes, as *divus* and *deus* are akin to the Sanskrit *dēva*, "God"; and the latter, like *div*, "heaven," springs from *div*, "to shine."
although apparently created expressly for the perfect, occurs sometimes, also, as expressing an action in transition. On the other hand, in neuter verbs the Sanskrit has the advantage of being able to use the participles in "ta", which are properly passive, with active, and, indeed, with a perfect meaning; and this power is very often employed, while the passive signification in the said participle of verbs neuter is limited, as in the above example, to the singular neuter in the impersonal constructions. As example of the active perfect meaning, the following may serve, Nalus XII. 13.: kwa nu rōjan gatā 'si (euphonic for gatas asi), "quone, rex! profectus es?"

514. The Sanskrit is entirely devoid of a form for the plusquam perfect, and it employs, where that tense might be expected, either a gerund expressive of the relation, "after" — which, where allusion is made to a future time, stands, also, for the future absolute — or the locative absolute, in sentences like apakrantē nālē rōjan damayanti . . . abudhyata, "after Nalas had departed, O king! (profecto Nalo) Damayanti awoke."

515. But if it is asked, whether the Sanskrit has, from the oldest antiquity, employed its three past tenses without syntactical distinction, and uselessly expended its formative power in producing them; or whether the usage of the language has, in the course of time, dropped the finer degrees of signification, by which they might, as in Greek, have been originally distinguished; I think I must decide for the latter opinion: for as the forms of language gradually wear out and become abraded, so, also, are meanings subjected to corruption and mutilation. Thus, the Sanskrit is entirely devoid of a form for the plusquam perfect, and it employs, where that tense might be expected, either a gerund expressive of the relation, "after" — which, where allusion is made to a future time, stands, also, for the future absolute — or the locative absolute, in sentences like apakrantē nālē rōjan damayanti . . . abudhyata, "after Nalas had departed, O king! (profecto Nalo) Damayanti awoke."

* Nal. XI. 26.: ākrandumānāi sansrutya javāṇā 'bhīṣasāra, "sente postquam audierat (after hearing the weeping) cum velocitate advenit."

† Nal. X. 22.: kathām buddhād bhāviṣyatī, "how will she feel in spirit, after she has been awakened (after awaking)"
skṛit has an immense number of verbs, which signify "to go," the employment of which must have been originally distinguished by the difference in the kind of motion which each was intended to express, and which are still, in part, so distinguished. I have already noticed elsewhere, that the Sanskrit sarpaṃi, "I go," must have had the same meaning as serpo and ἑρν, because the Indians, like the Romans, name the snake from this verb (सिङ्गर सर्प-स "serpens"). If, then, the nicer significations of each one of the three forms by which, in Sanskrit, the past is expressed, gradually, through the misuse of language, became one, so that each merely expressed time past, I am of opinion, that it was originally the function of the reduplicated preterite, like its cognate form in Greek, to express an action completed. The syllable of reduplication only implies an intensity of the idea, and gives the root an emphasis, which is regarded by the spirit of the language as the type of that which is done, completed, in contradistinction to that which is conceived to be in being, and which has not yet arrived at an end. Both in sound and in meaning the perfect is connected with

[G. Ed. p. 750.] the Sanskrit intensive, which likewise has a reduplication, that here, for greater emphasis, further receives a vowel augment by Guna. According to signification, the Sanskrit intensive is, as it were, a superlative of the verbal idea; for, e.g. dedēpya-māna means "very shining." In respect of form, this intensive is important

* I believe I may include here the German root slip, stl (schleifen); Old High German stencil, sleif, stilum; English "I slip." We should expect in Gothic sleipa, slaip, slipum, preserving the old tenuis, as in slēpa = swapim, "I sleep." The form slip is founded on a transposition of sarpa to sarb. The transition of r into l, and the weakening of the a to i, cannot surprise us. Considering the very usual exchange of semi-vowels with one another, and the by no means unusual phenomenon, that a root is divided into several, by different corruptions of form, we may include here, too, the root swip, swif (schweifen); Middle High German swip, swif, swifen.
for comparison with the European cognate languages, because the moods which spring from its present indicative afford, as it were, the prototype of the imperative and the optative of the Greek perfect, and of the German subjunctive of the preterite; compare preliminarily bāban-
dhyām, "I much wish to bind," with the Gothic bundyau (from baibundyau), "I might bind," and the imperative vdva-
dhi (from vach, "to speak"), with the Greek κέκραγθε, which is connected with it in formation, though not radically. The first augmented preterite of this intensive comes, in respect to form, very close to the Greek plusquam perfect; compare atūtupam, plural atūtupma, with ἐτετύφειν, ἐτετύφειμεν. As every completed action is also past, the transition of the vocal symbol of completion to that of the past is very easy, and the gradual withdrawal of the primary meaning is not surprising, as we must, in German also, paraphrase the completion of an action in a manner already pointed out by the Sanskrit, while our simple preterite, which is akin to the Greek perfect, and which, in Gothic also, in a certain number of verbs, has preserved the reduplication, corresponds in meaning to the Greek imperfect and aorist.

516. As regards the two augmented preterites, which appear, in Greek, as imperfect and aorist, there is no occasion, in the form by which they are distinguished from one another, to assume a primitive intention in the language to apply them to different objects, unless such aorists as—in Greek, ἔλιπτων, ἔδων, contrasted with ἔλειπτων, ἔδιδων, in Sanskrit, alipam,* adām, opposed to alimpam, adaddām—are considered original, and, in their brevity and succinctness, contrasted with the cumbersomeness of the

---

* The Sanskrit root lip is not connected with the Greek ΛΙΠ, but means "to smear," and to it belong the Greek λίπος, ἀλείφω. But alipam stands so far in the same relation to alimpam that ἔλιπτων does to ἔλειπτων, that it has divested itself of the inserted nasal, as ἔλιπτων has of the Guna vowel.
imperfect, a hint be found, that through them the language is desirous of expressing such actions or conditions of the past, as appear to us momentary, from their ranking, when recounted, with other events, or for other reasons. It might then be said that the language unburthens itself in the aorist of the Guna and other class characteristics, only because, in the press of the circumstances to be announced, it has no time to utter them; just as, in Sanskrit, in the second person singular imperative, the lighter verbal form is employed, on account of the haste with which the command is expressed, and, e.g., vid-dhi, "know," yung-dhi, "bind," stand opposed to the first person vēdāni, "let me know," yunajāni, "let me bind." But the kind of aorist just mentioned is, both in Sanskrit and in Greek, proportionably rarer, and the withdrawing of the class characteristics extends, in both languages, not to the aorist alone, and in both this tense appears, for the most part, in a form more full in sound than the imperfect. Compare, in Sanskrit, adikšham = eśeṇz with the imperfect adiśham, which bears the complete form of the aorist above mentioned. In the sibilant of the first aorist, however, I cannot recognise that element of sound, [G. Ed. p. 752] which might have given to this tense its peculiar meaning; for this sibilant, as will be shewn hereafter, belongs to the verb substantive, which might be expected in all tenses, and actually occurs in several, that, in their signification, present no point of coincidence. But if, notwithstanding, in Sanskrit, or at the time of the identity of the Sanskrit with its cognate languages, a difference of meaning existed between the two augmented preterites, we are compelled to adopt the opinion, that the language began very early to employ, for different ends, two forms which, at the period of formation, had the same signification, and to attach finer degrees of meaning to trifling, immaterial differences of form. It is requisite to observe here, that, in the history of languages, the case not unfrequently occurs, that
one and the same form is, in the lapse of time, split into several, and then the different forms are applied by the spirit of the language to different ends. Thus, in Sanskrit, *dātā*, from the base *dātār* (§. 144.), means both "the giver" and "he about to give"; but, in Latin, this one form, bearing two different meanings, has been parted into two; of which the one, which is modern in form, and has arisen from the old by the addition of an *u* (*dātārus*), has assumed to itself alone the task of representing a future participle; while the other, which has remained more true to the original type, appears, like the kindred Greek *dōthόρ*, only as a noun of agency.

**THE IMPERFECT.**

517. We proceed to a more particular description of the different kinds of expression for past time, and consider next the tense, which I call in Sanskrit, according to its form, the monoform augmented preterite, in contradistinction to that which corresponds in form to the Greek aorist, and which I term the multiform preterite, since in it seven different formations may be perceived, of which four correspond, more or less, to the Greek first aorist, and three to the second. Here, for the sake of brevity and uniformity, the appellations imperfect and aorist may be retained for the Sanskrit also, although both tenses may in Sanskrit, with equal propriety, be named imperfect and aorist, since they both in common, and together with the reduplicated preterite, represent at one time the aorist, at another the imperfect. That, which answers in form to the Greek imperfect, receives, like the aorist, the prefix of an *a* to express the past: the class characteristics are retained, and the personal terminations are the more obtuse or secondary (§. 430.), probably on account of the root being loaded with the augment. This exponent of the past, which is easily recognised in the Greek *e*, may bear the name of augment in Sanskrit also. Thus, in the first conjugation, we may compare *atarp-a-m*, "I delighted,"
with ἑτερπον; in the second, adadda-m, "I gave," with ἑδίδων; astri-naa-am (see § 437. Rem.), "I strewed," with ἑστρόπ-νυ-ν; and akri-nd-m, "I bought," with ἑπερ-νά-ν. As the conjugation of the imperfect of the three last-mentioned verbs has been already given (§§ 481. 485. 488.), where the weight of the personal terminations is considered, I shall only annex here the complete one of atarp-a-m and ἑτερπ-ο-ν.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SINGULAR.</th>
<th>DUAL.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SANSKRIT.</strong></td>
<td><strong>GREEK.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>atarp-a-m,</td>
<td>ἑτερπ-ο-ν,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>atarp-a-s,</td>
<td>ἑτερπ-ε-ζ,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>atarp-a-t,</td>
<td>ἑτερπ-ε(τ),</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLURAL.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SANSKRIT.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>atarp-ά-να,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>atarp-ά-τα,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>atarp-ά-ν,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“Remark.—In the Veda dialect the τ, which, according to § 461., has been lost in atarpan for atarpant, has been retained under the protection of an s, which begins the following word; thus, in the Rig-Veda (Rosen, p. 99), ἰβα "m avanwant swabishtim, "illum colebant fauste aggredientem." According to the same principle, in the accusative plural, instead of the ις, to be expected in accordance with §§ 236. 239., of which, according to a universal law of sound, only n has remained, we find in the Veda dialect nt, in case the word following begins with s; * e.g. ḫaṁsaṁte ἵν τρच φοτέρ asmānt su tatra chodaya, "nos bene ibi dirigē" (Rosen. l. c. p. 13). I do not hesitate to consider the t of asmānt as the euphonic mutation of an s, as also, under other circumstances, one s before another s, in order to make itself more perceptible in pronunciation, becomes

---

* See § 437. Rem.  † See § 461.
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t; as e.g. from vas, "to dwell," comes the future vat-sydmi and the aorist avdt-sam. The original accusative termination in is appears in the Vėdas also as ir, and indeed in bases in i and u, in case the word following begins with a vowel or y, as, in general, a final s, after vowels other than a, ã becomes r before all sonant letters. Examples of plural accusatives in ir (for n must become Anuswāra before r, as before s) are  giriśr  acabhāyātana, "nubes excitate" (l. c. p. 72);  varam  vasaśr  iha rudrān  adityān  uta  yajō, "tu Agnis! Vas-sues hic, Rudras atque Aditis filios sacris cole" (l. c. p. 85). Bases in a have lost the r in the accusative plural. The circumstance, however, that they replace the n of the common accusative terminations with Anuswāra (n), as in rudrān, adityān, just mentioned, appears to me to evince that they likewise terminated origi-

nally in ir: the r has been dropped, but its effect—the change of n into i—has remained. At least it is not the practice in the Rig Vėda, particularly after a long ã, to replace a final n with Anuswāra; for we read, l. c. §. 210., vidwān "skilful," not vidhān vidwān, although a v follows, before which, according to Pānini, as before y, r, and vowels, in the Vėda dialect, the termination an should be replaced by ān (compare Rosen, p. IV. 2.); a rule which is probably taken too universally, and should properly be limited to the accusative plural (the principal case where an occurs), where the Zend also employs an ā, and not n (§. 239.). The accusative termination ir for is is, however, explained in a manner but little satisfactory, by Rosen, in his very valuable edition of a part of the Rig-Vėda, p. XXXIX, 5.; and the t mentioned above is considered by the Indian grammarians as an euphonic insertion (Smaller Sanskrit Grammar, §§. 82a. 82b. Rem.). If, however, an initial s, from a disposition towards a t preceding, has such influence as to annex that letter, it appears to me far more natural for it to have had
the power to preserve a t, which actually exists in the primitive grammar, or to change an s into that letter.

518. The Zend, as found in the Zend Avesta, appears to have almost entirely given up the augment, at least with the exception of the aorist mentioned in § 469., and which is remarkable in more than one respect, $\text{wururdhusha}, \text{" thou didst grow," and the form mentioned by Burnouf, }\text{as, "he was," }\text{donhd$t, "if he were".}\text{[G. Ed. p. 756.]}\text{ found no instances, which can be relied upon, of its retention, unless, perhaps, }\text{apathayen,\text{" they went" (Vend. S. p. 43, l. 4.), must pass as such; and we are not to read, as might be conjectured, in place of it }\text{apathayen, and the initial vowel is the preposition }\text{as, which, perhaps, is contained in some other forms also, which might be explained by the augment. Thus, perhaps, in the first Fargard of the Vendidad, the frequently-recurring forms }\text{frathwercsem (or }\text{frathwarcesem), "I made," "I formed," and }\text{frakerenat, "he made," may be distributed into }\text{fra and athwercsem and akerenat. I, however, now think it more probable that their first syllable is compounded of the prepositions }\text{fra}

---

* The initial $u$ appears to have been formed from $a$ by the assimilating influence of the $a$ of the second syllable. I shall recur to this aorist hereafter.

† Burnouf (Yaça, p. 431) proposes to read $\text{asa}$ for $\text{as}$. But this form, also, has something uncommon, since the Vedic $\text{as}$ (of which hereafter) would lead us to expect, in Zend, $\text{do}$, as a final Sanskrit $s$, with a preceding $a$, regularly becomes $\text{do}$; but $\text{as}$ becomes $\text{a}$ (see § 60°). Without the augment we find, in the Zend Avesta, both the reading $\text{asa}$ and $\text{as}$, provided this form actually belongs to the verb substantive.

‡ Thus we should read instead of $\text{apathayen}$; compare the Sanskrit $\text{apathayan}$, "they went," with an inserted nasal. $\text{E}n\varsigma\dot{e}v\text{ corresponds in Greek. But should we read }\text{apathayen for apathayen the long }\text{d would not be the augment, but the preposition }\text{a}$.}
and A. The combination of these two prepositions is very generally used in the Zend; as, frādaya, "value" (Vend. S. p. 124), frāmainn hunvanha, "praise me" (Vend S. p. 39), where the prepositions are separated from the verb,* as in the passage frā vayó patain frā urvara ucsyain, "aves volent arbores cres- cunt"† (Vend S. p. 257), and in frā zaśta śnayānuha, "wash the hands" (l. c. p. 457). A form which, if the lithographed codex of the Vend S. is correct, might appear best adapted to testify to the existence of the augment in Zend, is usazayānha, "thou wast born," a word which is remarkable in other respects also (see §. 469.). But as long as the correctness of the reading is not confirmed by other MSS., or generally as long as the augment is not more fully established in Zend, I am disposed to consider the vowel which stands between the preposition and the root as simply a means of conjunction; and for a I should prefer reading i or ē, just as in uś-i-hista, "stand up" (Vend. S. p. 458), uś-i-histata, "stand ye up" (l. c. p. 459), uś-ē-histaili, "he stands up.

* The comparison of other MSS. must decide whether the accusative of the pronoun is rightly conjoined with this. Anquetil renders this imperative with the word following, kharōteō, "on account of the eating, of the nourishing," strangely enough by "qui me mange en m’invoquant avec ardeur," as he also translates the following words, aōivi (= śajī abhi) maime stāomānī (stäomāni?) stāidhi, "extol me in praise," by "qui m’adresse humblement sa prière. The form hunvanha is the imperative middle, where, as often occurs, the character of the first class is added to that of the fifth.

† Patain, "volent," and ucsyain, "crescunt," with which the Greek πέρομαι and our Feder and wachsen are to be compared, are imperfects of the subjunctive mood, which, with this tense, always combines a present signification.
But a also occurs in this verb, inserted as a conjunctive vowel between the preposition and the root; for, p. 456, l. 18., we read us-a-histatu, “stand ye up.” I would therefore, if the reading us-a-za-yanha, “thou wast born,” should prove itself from the majority of MSS. to be genuine, prefer, nevertheless, regarding the a as a conjunctive vowel, rather than as the augment.

519. The following examples may throw sufficient light on the conjugation, for the first class, of the Zend imperfect active, which admits of tolerably copious citation: ɐ̄uzbar-ē-m, “I brought forward” (Vend. S. p. 493); frāthwarēs-ē-m or frāthwerēs-ē-m, “I created”

[G Ed. p. 758.] (l. c. 117, &c.); frādēsāyēm, “I shewed,” from frādēs-ayē-m = Sanskrit प्रत्यासाधेम प्रत्यास-ayā-m, “I caused to shew” (see §. 42.); frādēs-ayō, “thou shewedst” (l. c. p. 123); kēry-ney, “thou didst make”;

pērīs-a-ī, “he asked,” = चप्परिः aprichchh-a-t (l. c. p. 123); bav-a-ī, “he was,” = चनवं abhav-a-t, (p. 125);

jus-a-ī, “he came,” = चज्जस्म agachchh-a-ī, “he went;” paiti saṁh-ā-ma, “we spoke”† (pp. 493, 494, repeatedly) = प्रत्यासां समासासांमा; anhēn, “they were” (p. 103 erroneously anhin) = चासान् dsan.

I am not able to quote the second person plural, but there can be no uncertainty regarding its form, and from usihistata, “stand ye up,” we may infer, also, us'histata, “ye stood up,” since, in Sanskrit as in Greek, the imperative in the second person plural is only distinguished from the imperfect by the omission of the augment. Examples of the second conjugation are, ɐ̄dadhan-ī-m, “I placed,” “I made” (Vend. S. p. 116) = सद्धार् adadhā-m, erīθν-ν;

* For kērēnaδ: there is, that is to say, as often happens, the character of the first class added to the class character, which was already present; as though, in Greek, ἐδέκανυ-ε-ε were said for ἐδόκανυ-ε-ε.

† Anquetil renders this, “je viens de vous parler.”
"I spoke" (p. 123); "thou spokest" (p. 226). "he spoke," occurs very often; kērē-nad-t, "he made" (p. 135). In the plural I conjecture the forms amrut-ma, amrut-ta = Sanskrit abru-ma, abru-ta; and kērē-nu-ma, kērē-nu-ta, like such Greek forms as ἐστόρ-νυ-μεν, ἐστόρ-νυ-τε = Sans- [G. Ed. p. 759.] krit astri-nu-ma, astri-nu-ta. The third person plural does not admit of being traced with the same certainty.

520. With respect to the use of the imperfect it deserves to be remarked, that, in Zend, this tense is very frequently employed as the subjunctive of the present, and that the reduplicated preterite also occasionally occurs in the same sense. In such cases, the past appears to be regarded from its negative side as denying the actual present, and to be thus adapted to denote the subjunctive, which is likewise devoid of reality. Here we must class the phenomenon, that, in Zend, the subjunctive, even where it is actually formally expressed, far more frequently expresses the present by the imperfect than by the present; and that, in Sanskrit, the conditional is furnished with the augment; and that, also, in German and Latin, the conditional relation is expressed by past tenses. Examples of the Zend imperfect indicative with the sense of the present subjunctive are, ἀμφάλη fracha kērēnēn "they may cut to pieces," = Sanskrit स्त्रिन् akrintan (Vend. S. p. 233); यात्र सप्त व नारा अन्हेन pancha va, "there may be either two persons or five"; वात्र द्व येन।

* This form is based on the Sanskrit abravam, for which abravam : the contraction in Zend is similar to that of यात्र यावम्, "oryzam," to 739 yašm. Regarding the exchange of b with m in mraóm see § 63.

† These two persons pre-suppose, in Sanskrit, abrō-s, abrō-t, for which, with irregular insertion of a conjunctive vowel i, abravi-s, abravi-t, are used.
VERBS,
anhat Athravd, “if it is a priest”;
y&zi anhat rastraesto, “if it is a warrior (lit., stander in a car)”;
y&zi anhat vastryo, “if it is a cultivator”;
y&zi anhat spa, “if it is a dog” (l. c. p. 230, 231);

[G. Ed. p. 76].] y&zi va&szn mazdayasna zaim radhaya&
† “if the worshippers of Ormuzd wish to cultivate the earth (make to grow)” (p. 198). It is clear, that in most of the examples the conjunction y&zi has introduced the imperfect in the sense of a subjunctive present, for this conjunction loves to use a mood which is not indicative, whether it be the potential, the subjunctive, or, as in the passages quoted, the imperfect of the indicative, as the representative of the subjunctive present. However, the indicative present often occurs after y&zi (Vend. S. pp. 263, &c. y&zi paiti-
jasaiti); where, however, the reduplicated preterite stands beside this conditional particle, there it is clear that the past is regarded, as in the imperfect, as the symbol of non-actuality, and invested with a modal application. Thus we read in the second Fargard of the Vendidad (ed. Ols-
hausen, p. 12), y&zi moj yima ndit vivise “if thou, Yima! obeyest me not”; and in the sixth Fargard, y&zi tattava “if he can,” or “if they can,” “if it is possible”—according to Anquetil, “si on le peut”; Vend. S. p. 12, y&zi thvad didvasa, “if he hates thee,” according to Anquetil “si l’homme vous irrita.”

521. If we now turn to the European cognate languages, it is remarkable that the Lithuanian, Slavonic, and German, which appear, as it were, as three children born at one birth

* Regarding the termination of anhat more will be said hereafter.
† Thus I read for y&zi radhaya& for which, p. 170, occurs, with two other faults, y&zi radhayen.
in the great family of languages, which occupies our attention, diverge from one another in respect to the past, and have so divided the store of Sanskrit-Zend past forms, that that of the imperfect has fallen to the lot of [G. Ed. p. 761.] the Lithuanian, and the Sclavonic has taken the aorist, and, in fact, the first aorist, while the German has received the form of the Greek perfect. The augment, however, has been dropped by the Lithuanian and Sclavonic, and the Gothic has retained the reduplication only in a small number of verbs, while in German it lies concealed in forms like hiess, lief, fiel, of which hereafter.

522. As the imperfect now engages our attention, we must, for the present, leave the Sclavonic and German unnoticed, and first bestow our notice on that Lithuanian preterite, which is called, by Ruhig, the perfect. It might, with equal propriety, be termed imperfect* or aorist, as it, at the same time, simultaneously represents these two tenses; and its use as a perfect is properly a misuse; as, also, in the Lettish, which is so nearly allied, this tense is actually called the imperfect, and the perfect is denoted by a participle perfect, with the present of the verb substantive; e.g. es sinnnyu, "I did know," es esmu sinnayis, "I have known (been having known)." That the Lithuanian preterite in form answers to the imperfect and not to the second aorist, is clear from this, that it retains the class characteristics given up by the aorist; for buwâl, "I was," or "have been," answers to the Sanskrit जभवम् abhavam and Greek ἔφυν, and, in the plural, búw-o-me, to the Zend bav-ā-ma, Sanskrit abhav-ā-ma, Greek ἔφυ-ο-μεν, not to the aorist जभूम् abhū-ma, ἔφυ-μεν; although, if necessary, the first person singular buwâl might be compared with जभूम् abhūvam, to which, on account of the u of the first syllable, it appears to approach

• Cf. § 790. Rem.
more closely than to the imperfect abhavam. I believe, however, that the Lithuanian u of buwâ is a weakening of a; and I recognise in this form one of the fairest and truest transmissions from the mythic age of our history of languages; for which reason it may be proper to annex the full conjugation of this tense of the verb substantive, and to contrast with it the corresponding forms of the cognate languages, to which I also add the Latin bam, as I consider forms like amabam, docebam, &c., as compounded, and their bam to be identical with the Sanskrit abhavam, to which it has just the relation which m alo has to movolo, or that the Old High German bim, “I am,” has to its plural birumês, from bivumês (see §. 20.).

**SINGULAR.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sanskrit</th>
<th>Zend</th>
<th>Lith.</th>
<th>Latin</th>
<th>Greek</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>abhav-a-m</td>
<td>baom</td>
<td>buwa-û</td>
<td>-bu-m</td>
<td>'êfu-o-ûv.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abhav-a-s</td>
<td>bav-û</td>
<td>buwa-î</td>
<td>-bâ-û</td>
<td>'êfu-e-s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abhav-a-t</td>
<td>bav-û</td>
<td>buw-o</td>
<td>-ba-t</td>
<td>'êfu-e-(r).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DUAL.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sanskrit</th>
<th>Zend</th>
<th>Lith.</th>
<th>Latin</th>
<th>Greek</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>abhav-û-va</td>
<td>buw-o-wa</td>
<td>.....</td>
<td>.....</td>
<td>.....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abhav-û-tam</td>
<td>buw-o-tn</td>
<td>.....</td>
<td>êfu-e-tov.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abhav-û-tâm</td>
<td>buw-o-tam</td>
<td>.....</td>
<td>êfu-e-têv.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PLURAL.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sanskrit</th>
<th>Zend</th>
<th>Lith.</th>
<th>Latin</th>
<th>Greek</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>abhav-û-ma</td>
<td>buw-o-me</td>
<td>-ba-mus</td>
<td>'êfu-o-meuv.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abhav-a-tha</td>
<td>buw-o-te</td>
<td>-bâ-tis</td>
<td>'êfu-e-te.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abhav-a-n</td>
<td>buw-o-te</td>
<td>-ba-nt</td>
<td>'êfu-ov.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 From buw-a-m: see §. 438.  
2 See §. 526.  
3 Bavaš-cha, “erasque.”


* The root is krît, properly karî, and belongs to those roots of the sixth class which, in the special tenses, receive a nasal. To the same clas-
FORMATION OF TENSES.

κὲρεντέμ, and Greek ἐκεῖπον, [G. Ed. p. 763.] which has lost the t of the root.

SINGULAR.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>akrint-a-m, κέρεντ-ε-m,</td>
<td>kirt-a-u (see §. 438.), ἐκεῖπ-ο-ν.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>akrint-a-s, κέρεντ-ο,</td>
<td>kirt-a-i (see §. 419.), ἐκεῖπ-ε-ς.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>akrint-a-t, κέρεντ-α-τ.</td>
<td>kirt-o.</td>
<td>ἐκεῖπ-ε-(τ).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DUAL.

| | kirt-o-wa |
| akrint-a-tam, κέρεν-α-τέμ? | kirt-o-tu, | ἐκεῖπ-ε-τον. |
| akrint-a-tam, κέρεν-α-ταίμ? | like Sing. |
| | ἐκεῖπ-ἐ-την. |

PLURAL.

| akrent-a-ma, κέρεντ-ά-μα, | kirt-o-me, | ἐκεῖπ-ο-μεν. |
| akrent-a-ta, κέρεντ-ά-τα, | kirt-o-te, | ἐκεῖπ-ε-τε. |
| akrent-a-na, κέρεν-έ-ν, | like Sing. |
| | ἐκεῖπ-ο-ν. |

524. Many Lithuanian verbs, which follow, in the present, the analogy of the Sanskrit of the first class, [G. Ed. p. 764.] change, in the preterite, into the tenth, and, in fact, so that they terminate in the first person singular, in ia-u (=Sanskrit aya-m), but, in the other persons, instead of ia employ an ε, which unite s with i of the second person singular to ei.

belongs also, among others, lip, “to besmear,” whence limpámi, alimpam (second aorist alipam), with which the Lithuanian limpá, “I paste on” (preterite lippau, future lipsu, infinitive lipti), appears to be connected. Pott acutely compares the Gothic salbó so that sa would be an obscure d preposition grown up with the root. The present of kirtau is kertá, and there are several verbs in Lithuanian which contrast an e in the present with the i of the preterite, future, and infinitive. This e either springs direct from the original a of the root kart—as, among others, the permanent e of degu, “I burn,” =Sanskrit dahámi - or the original a has first been weakened to i, and this has been corrupted, in the present, to e; so that kertá would have nearly the same relation to the preterite kirtau, future kir-su (for kirt-su), and infinitive kirs-ti (from kirt-ti), as, in Old High German, the plural losamés, “we read,” to the Gothic lisam, and its own singular lisu.
This analogy is followed, by wežiau, "I led," sekiau, "I followed," whence weži, sekei; weži, seké; wežiau, sekéwa; wežeta, sekéta; wežeme, sekéme; wežete, sekète. Observe the analogy with Mielke's third conjugation (see §. 506.), and compare the preterite laikiau, §. 506.

525. In the Lithuanian tense which is called the habitual imperfect, we find dawau; as suk-dawau, "I am wont to turn," which is easily recognised as an appended auxiliary verb. It answers tolerably well to dawyau (from dū-mi), "I gave, have given," from which it is distinguished only in this point, that it is inflected like buwau and kirtau, while the simple dawyau, dawei, dawe, dawéwa &c., follows the conjugation of wežiau, sekiau, which has just (§. 524.) been presented, with this single trifling point of difference, that, in the first person singular, instead of i, it employs a y; thus, dawyau for dawiau. As in Sanskrit, together with dá, "to give," on which is based the Lithuanian dūmi, a root धः dhu, "to place" (with the preposition वि� vi, "to make") occurs, which is similarly represented in Lithuanian, and is written in the present demi ("I place"); so might also the auxiliary verb which is contained in suk-dawau, be ascribed to this root, although the simple preterite of demi (from dami=Sanskrit dadhāmi, Greek τιθημι), is not dawyau, or dawiau, but dēyau. But according to its origin, demi has the same claim as dūmi upon the vowel a, and the addition of an inorganic w in the preterite, and the appending of the auxiliary verb in suk-dawau might proceed from a period when dūmi, "I give," and demi, "I place," agreed as exactly in their conjugation.

[G. Ed. p. 765.] as the corresponding old Indian forms dadāmi and dadhāmi, which are distinguished from one another only by the aspirate, which is abandoned by the Lithuanian. As dadhāmi, through the preposition vi, obtains the meaning "to make," and, in Zend, the simple verb also signifies "to make," demi would, in this sense, be
more proper as an auxiliary verb to enter into combination with other verbs; and then *suk-dawau*, "I was wont to turn," would, in its final portion, coincide with that of the Gothic *sök-i-da*, "I sought;" *sök-i-dëdum*, "we sought," which last I have already, in my System of Conjugation, explained in the sense of "we did seek," and compared with *dëds*, "dec'd." I shall return hereafter to the Gothic *sök-i-da*, *sök-i-dëdum*. It may, however, be here further remarked, that, exclusive of the Sanskrit, the Lithuanian *dawau* of *suk-dawau* might also be contrasted with the Gothic *tau*ya, "I do" (with which the German *thun* is no way connected); but then the Lithuanian auxiliary verb would belong rather to the root of "to give," than to that of "to place," "to make"; for the Gothic requires *tenues* for primitive medials, but not for such as the Lithuanian, which possesses no aspirates, contrasts with the Sanskrit aspirated medials, which, in Gothic, appear likewise as medials. But if the Gothic *tau*ya, "I do," proceeds from the Sanskrit root, *dä*, "to give," it then furnishes the only example I know of, where the Gothic *au* corresponds with a Sanskrit *a*; but in Sanskrit itself, *äu* for *a* is found in the first and third person singular of the reduplicated preterite, where *e.g.* ददी *dadäu*, "I" or "he gave," is used for *dadd* (from *dadd-a*). The relation, however, of *tau* to *dä* (and this appears to me better) might be thus regarded, that the *d* has been weakened to *u*, and an unradical *a* prefixed to the latter letter; for that which [G. Ed. p. 766.] takes place regularly before *h* and *r* (see §. 82.) may also for once have occurred without such an occasion.

526. The idea that the Latin imperfects in *bam*, as also the futures in *bo*, contain the verb substantive, and, in fact, the root, from which arise *fui, fore*, and the obsolete subjunctive *fuam*, has been expressed for the first time in my System of Conjugation. If it is in general admitted, that grammatical forms may possibly arise through composi-
tion, then certainly nothing is more natural than, in the conjugation of attributive verbs, to expect the introduction of the verb substantive, in order to express the copula, or the conjunction of the subject which is expressed by the personal sign with the predicate which is represented by the root. While the Sanskrit and Greek, in that past tense which we term aorist, conjoin the other root of the verb substantive, viz. AS, ES, with the attributive roots, the Latin betakes itself, so early as the imperfect, to the root FU; and I was glad to find, what I was not aware of on my first attempt at explaining the forms in *bam* and *bo*, that this root also plays an important part in grammar in another kindred branch of language, viz. in Celtic, and exhibits to us, in the Irish dialect of the Gaelic, forms like *meal-fa-m*, or *meal-fa-mar*, or *meal-fa-moid*, "we will deceive," *meal-fai-dhe*, or *meal-fa-bar*, "ye will deceive," *meal-fai-d*, "they will deceive," *meal-fu-dh me*, "I will deceive," (literally, "there will deceive I"), *meal-fai-r*, "thou wilt deceive," *meal-fai-dh*, "he will deceive." The abbreviated form *fam* of the first person plural, as it is wanting in the plural affix, answers remarkably to the Latin *bam*, while the full form *fa-mar* (r for s) comes very near the plural *ba-mus*. The circumstance, that the Latin *bam* has a past meaning, while that of the Irish *fam* is future, need not hinder us from considering the two forms, in respect to their origin, as identical, especially as *bam*, since it has lost the augment, bears in itself no formal expression of the past, nor *fam* any formal sign of the future. The Irish form should be properly written *fiam* or *biam*, for by itself *biad me* signifies "I will be" (properly, "there will be I"), *biodh-maod*, "we will be," where the character of the third person singular has grown up with the root, while the conditional expression *ma bhium*, "if I shall be," is free from this incumbrance. In these forms, the exponent of the future relation is the i, with which, there-
fore, the Latin i of *ama-bis, ama-bit*, &c., and that of *eris, erit*, &c., is to be compared. This characteristic i is, however, dislodged in composition, in order to lessen the weight of the whole form, and at the same time the b is weakened to f; so that, while in Latin, according to the form of the isolated *fui, fore, fuam*, in the compound formations, *fum, fo*, might be expected, but in the Irish *bam*, the relation is exactly reversed. The reason is, however, in the Roman language, also an euphonic one; for it has been before remarked (§. 18.), that the Latin, in the interior (*Inlaut*) of a word, prefers the labial medial to the aspirate; so that, while the Sanskrit *bh*, in the corresponding Latin forms, always appears as f in the initial sound, in the interior (*Inlaut*), b is almost as constantly found: hence, *ti-bi* for तुम्हार् तू-भ्याम्; *ovi-bus, for स्विष्टम् avi-bhyas; ambo for Greek ἄμφω, Sanskrit अभी ubhāu; *nubes* for नभस nabhas, νέφος; *rabies* from रभ rabh, whence संत्त स्विराब्धha, "enraged," "furious"; *lubet* for लूभयति lubhyati, "he wishes"; *ruber* for ἐρυθρός, with which it has been already rightly compared by Voss, the labial being exchanged for a labial, and the e dropped, which letter evinces itself, from the kindred languages, [G. Ed. p. 768.] to be an inorganic prefix. The Sanskrit furnishes for comparison *rudhira, "blood,"* and, with respect to the root, also *rōhita* for रोधितa, "red." In *rufus*, on the contrary, the aspirate has remained; and if this had also been the case in the auxiliary verb under discussion, perhaps then, in the final portion of *ama-fum, ama-fo*, derivatives from the root, whence proceed *fui, fuam, fore, fio, facio*, &c., would have been recognised without the aid of the light thrown upon the subject by the kindred languages. From the Gaelic dialects I will here further cite the form *ba, "he was,"* which wants only the personal sign to be the same as the Latin *bat*, and, like the latter, ranks under the Sanskrit-Zend imperfect *abhavat, bavat*. The Gaelic *ba* is, however, deficient in the other persons; and in order to say "I
was," for which, in Irish, bann might be expected, ba me is used, i.e. "it was I."

527. The length of the class-vowel in the Latin third conjugation is surprising, e.g. in leg-ē-bam, for the third conjugation, is based, as has been remarked (§. 109. 1.) on the Sanskrit first or sixth class, the short a of which it has corrupted to ē, before r to ē. Ag. Benary believes this length must be explained by the concretion of the class-vowel with the augment.* It would, in fact, be very well, if, in this manner, the augment could be attributed to the Latin as the expression of the past. I cannot, however, so decidedly assent to this opinion, as I have before done,†

[G. Ed. p. 769.] particularly as the Zend also, to which I then appealed, as having occasionally preserved the augment only under the protection of preceding prepositions, has since appeared to me in a different light (§. 518.). There are, it cannot be denied, in the languages, inorganic or inflexive lengthenings or diphthongizations of vowels, originally short; as, in Sanskrit, the class-vowel just under discussion is lengthened before m and v, if a vowel follows next (vah-ā-mi, vah-ā-vas, vah-ā-mas); and as the Gothic does not admit a simple i and u before r and h, but prefixes to them, in this position, an a. The Latin lengthens the short final vowel (which corresponds to the Sanskrit a, and Greek o) of the base-words of the second declension before the termination rum of the genitive plural (lupā-rum), just as before bus in ambē-bus, duō-bus; and it might be said that the auxiliary verb bam also felt the necessity of being supported by a long vowel, and

---

* System of Latin sounds, p. 29. It being there stated that the coincidence of the Latin bam with the Sanskrit abhavam had not as yet been noticed, I must remark that this had been done in my Conjugational System, p. 97.

that, therefore, *leg-ē-bam*, not *leg-ē-bam*, or *leg-i-bam*, is employed.

528. In the fourth conjugation, the *ē* of *audiēbam* corresponds to the final *a* of the Sanskrit character of the tenth class, *aya*, which *a* has been dropped in the Latin present, with the exception of the first person singular and third person plural; but in the subjunctive and in the future, which, according to its origin, is likewise to be regarded as a subjunctive (*audiam*, *audiēs*, *audiēs*), has been retained in concretion with the modal exponent (see §. 505.). As the Latin *ē* frequently coincides with the Sanskrit diphthong *ē*, (*=a+i*), and, *e.g.*, the future *tundēs*, *tundēmus*, *tundēlis*, corresponds to the Sanskrit potential *tudēs*, *tudēma*, *tudēla* (from *tudēs*, &c.), so might also the *ē* of *tund-ē-bam*, *aud-ē-bam*, be divided into the elements *a+i*: thus *tundēbam* might be explained from *tundaibam*, where the *a* would be the class-vowel, which, in the present, as remarked above (§. 109*. 1.), has been weakened to *i*; so [G. Ed. p. 770.] that *tund-i-s*, *tund-i-t*, answer to the Sanskrit *tud-a-si*, *tud-a-ti*. The *i* contained in the *ē* of *tund-ē-bam* would then be regarded as the conjunctive vowel for uniting the auxiliary verb; thus, *tundēbam* would be to be divided into *tunda-i-bam*. This view of the matter might appear the more satisfactory, as the Sanskrit also much favors the practice of uniting the verb substantive in certain tenses with the principal verb, by means of an *i*, and, indeed, not only in roots ending in a consonant, where the *i* might be regarded as a means of facilitating the conjunction of opposite sounds, but also in roots which terminate in a vowel, and have no need at all of any such means; *e.g.* *dhāv-i-śyāmi*, "I will move" (also *dhā-śyāmi*), and *adhāv-i-śham*, "I moved"; though *adhāv-śham* would not be inconvenient to pronounce.

529. In favor of the opinion that the augment is contained in the *ē* of *audiēbam*, the obsolete futures of the fourth conjugation in *ibo* might be adduced (*expedibo*, *seibo*
aperibo, and others in Plautus), and the want of a preceding *i* in these forms might be explained by the circumstance, that the future has no augment. But imperfects in *ibam* also occur, and thence it is clear, that both the *i* of *ibo*, and that of *ibam*, should be regarded as a contraction of *iē*, and that the difference between the future and imperfect is only in this, that in the latter the full form (*iē*) has prevailed, but in the former has been utterly lost. In the common dialect *ibam*, *ibo*, from *eo*, answer to those obsolete imperfects and futures, only that here the *i* is radical. From the third person plural *eunt* (for *iunt*), and from the subjunctive *eam* (for *iam*), one would expect an imperfect *iēbam*.

[G. Ed. p. 771.] 530. Let us now consider the temporal augment, in which the Sanskrit agrees with the Greek, just as it does in the syllabic augment. It is an universal principle in Sanskrit, that when two vowels come together they melt into one. When, therefore, the augment stands before a root beginning with *a*, from the two short *a* a long *ā* is formed, as in Greek, from *e*, by prefixing the augment for the most part, an *η* is formed. In this manner, from the root of the verb substantive एस as, EΣ, arise एस एs, HΣ, whence, in the clearest accordance, the third person plural एसन एsan, ᾙσαν; the second एस एsta, ᾙστε; the first एस एsma, ᾲμεν, the latter for ᾲσμεν, as might be expected from the present ᾲσμεν. In the dual, ᾲστον, ᾲστην, answer admirably to एस-तम एs-tam, एस-तम as-tam. The first person singular is, in Sanskrit, एsam, for which, in Greek, ᾲσαν might be expected, to which we are also directed by the third person plural, which generally is the same as the first person singular (where, however, *ν* stands for *ντ*). The form ᾲν has passed over a whole syllable, and is exceeded by the Latin *eram* (from *esam*, see §. 22.) in true preservation of the original form, as in general the Latin has, in the verb substantive, nowhere permitted itself to be robbed of
the radical consonant, with the exception of the second person present, but, according to its usual inclination, has weakened the original $s$ between two vowels to $r$. It is highly probable that $éram$ was originally $éram$ with the augment. The abandonment of the augment rests, therefore, simply on the shortening of the initial vowel.

531. In the second and third person singular the Sanskrit introduces between the root and the personal sign $s$ and $t$ an $i$ as the conjunctive vowel; hence $áns$, $ásít$. Without this auxiliary vowel these two persons would necessarily have lost their characteristic, as two consonants are not admissible at the end of a word, as also in the Veda-dialect, in the third person, there really exists a form चास $ás$, with which the Doric $h$ agrees very well. But the Doric $h$, also, might, with Kühner (p. 234), be deduced from $h$, so that $s$ would be the character of the third person, the original $r$ of which, as it cannot stand at the end of a word, would have been changed into the cognate $s$, which is admissible for the termination. According to this principle, I have deduced neuters like $τετυφότ$, $τέρας$, from $τετυφότ$, $τέρατ$, as $πρός$ from $προτί = संस्कृत$ prati (see §. 152. concl.). If $h$ has arisen in a similar manner from $h$, this form would be the more remarkable, because it would then be a solitary example of the retention of the sign of the third person in secondary forms. Be this how it may, still the form $h$ is important for this reason, as it explains to us the common form $h$, the external identity of which with the $h$ of the first person must appear surprising. In this person $h$ stands for $hμ$ (middle $hμν$); but in the third, $h$ has the same relation to the Doric $h$ that $τύπτομεν$ has to $τύπτομες$, or that, in the dual, $τέρπετον$, $τέρπετον$, have to the Sanskrit tarpathas, tarpatus (§ 97.); and I doubt not, also, that the $v$ of $h$, “he was,” is a corruption of $s$.

"Remark.—In Sanskrit it is a rule, that roots in $s$, when
they belong, like as, to a class of conjugation which, in the special tenses, interposes no middle syllable between the root and personal termination, change the radical s in the third person into t; and at will in the second person also, where, nevertheless, the placing an s and its euphonic permutations is prevalent (see my smaller Sanskrit Grammar, §. 291.): thus सास sās, "to govern," forms, in the third person, solely asāt; in the second aśās (अश ा: aśāh), or likewise aśāt. As regards the third person aśāt, I believe that it is better to consider its t as the character of the third person than as a permutation of the radical s. For why else should the t have been retained principally in the third person, while the second person prefers the form aśās? At the period when the Sanskrit, like its sister languages, still admitted two consonants at the end of a word, the third person will

[G. Ed. p. 773.] have been aśās-t, and the second aśāt-s, as s before another s freely passes into t (see §. 517. Rem.): in the present state of the language, however, the last letter but one of aśās-t has been lost, and aśāt-s has, at will, either in like manner dropped the last but one, which it has generally done—hence, aśā(t)s—or the last, hence aśāt(s)."

532. With अस asī-s, "thou wast," असीत asī-t, "he was," the forms asas, aṣat, may also have existed, as several other verbs of the same class, in the persons mentioned, assume at will a or i as conjunctive vowel; as arōdis, arōdit, "thou didst weep," "he did weep"; or arōdas, arōdat, from rud (the Old High German riuzu, "I weep," pre-supposes the Gothic riuta, Latin rudo). I believe that the forms in as, at, are the elder, and that the forms in ās, āt, have found their way from the aorist(third formation), where the long ā of abōdhīs, abōdhīt, is to be explained as a compensation for the sibilant which has been dropped, which, in the other persons, is united with the root by a short i (abōdh-i-śham, abōdh-i-śhwa, abōdh-i-śhma). The pre-supposed forms asas, aṣat, are confirmed by the Zend,
also, where, in the third person, the form अन्हात् anhat* occurs, with suppression of the augment [G. Ed. p. 774.] (otherwise it would be दोन्हात् donhat) and the insertion of a nasal, according to §. 56*. I am not able to quote the second person, but it admits of no doubt that it is anhā (with cha, "and," अन्हास-cha). The originality of the conjunctive vowel a is confirmed also by the Latin, which nevertheless lengthens the same inorganically (but again, through the influence of a final m and t, shortens it), and which extends that letter, also, to those persons in which the Sanskrit and Greek, and probably, also, the Zend, although wanting in the examples which could be desired, unite the terminations to the root direct. Compare—

**SINGULAR.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>असम्,</td>
<td>गν,</td>
<td>eram.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>असिस्,</td>
<td>गς,</td>
<td>erās.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>असित् (Zend अन्हात, अस, Vedic अस),</td>
<td>गς, गν,</td>
<td>erat.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DUAL.**

| असवा | ... |
| अस्तम, | ... |
| अस्तम, | ... |

* I cannot, with Burnouf (Yaṣṇa, Notes, p. CXIV.), explain this anhat, and its plural anhēn, as a subjunctive (Lēt) or as an aorist; for a Lēt always requires a long conjunctive vowel, and, in the third person plural, aṁḥ for aṁḥ. And Burnouf actually introduces as Lēt the form दोन्हात् donhat (Yaṣṇa, p. CXVIII.), which is superior to anhat in that it retains the augment. But it need not surprise us, from what has been remarked in §. 520., that anhat and anhēn occur with a subjunctive signification. And Burnouf gives to the form nipārayanta, mentioned in §. 536. Rem., a subjunctive meaning, without recognising in it a formal subjunctive. The difference of the Zend anhat from the Sanskrit असित् as in the preservation of the nominative sign in bases ending with a consonant (द्वस्, द्रुच्स, see §. 138.)

† See §. 518.
"Remark.—The analogy with $bam$, $bäs$, may have occasioned the lengthening inorganically of the conjunctive vowel in Latin, where the length of quantity appears as an unconscious result of contraction, since, as has been shewn above [G. Ed. p. 775.] (see §. 526), $bam$, $bäs$, &c., correspond to the Sanskrit $a-bhavam$, $a-bhavas$. After dropping the $v$, the two short vowels coalesed and melted down into a long one, in a similar manner to that in which, in the Latin first conjugation, the Sanskrit character $aya$ (of the tenth class), after rejecting the $y$ has become $ä$ (§. 504.); and hence, $amäs$, $amätis$, correspond to the Sanskrit $kämayasi$, "thou lovest," $kämayatha", "ye love." The necessity of adjusting with the utmost nicety the forms $eräm$, $eräs$, &c., to those in $bam$, $bäs$, and of placing throughout a long $ä$, where the final consonant does not exert its shortening influence, must appear so much the greater, as in the future, also, $eris$, $erit$, $erimus$, $eritis$, stand in the fullest agreement with $bis$, $bit$, $bimus$, $bitis$; and for the practical use of the language the difference of the two tenses rests on the difference of the vowel preceding the personal termination. A contrast so strong as that between the length of the gravest and the shortness of the lightest vowel could therefore be found here only through the fullest reasons for wishing its appearance. That the $i$ of the future is not simply a conjunctive vowel, but an actual expression of the future, and that it answers to the Sanskrit $ya$ of $-yasi$, $-yati$, &c.; or, reversing the case, that the $ä$ of the imperfect is simply a vowel of conjunction, and has nothing to do with the expression of the relation of time, this can be felt no longer from the particular point of view of the Latin.

533. In roots which begin with $i$, $i$, $u$, $ä$, or $ri$, the Sanskrit augment does not follow the common rules of
sound, according to which a with i or i is contracted into ṃ (=a + i), and with u or û to ū (=a + u), and with ri (from ar) becomes ar, but ṛ di is employed for ṛ ḍ; for झ du, झो ḍ; and छ छ for छर ar: so from ichh, "to wish" (as substitute of ish), comes ैichham, "I wished"; from uksh, "to sprinkle," comes ैukṣham, "I sprinkled." It cannot be ascertained with certainty what the reason for this deviation from the common path is. Perhaps the higher augment of the vowel is to be ascribed to the importance of the augment for the modification of the relation of time, and to the endeavor to make the augment more perceptible to the ear, in roots beginning with a vowel, than it would be if it were contracted with i, û to ṃ, or with u, û to ū, thereby giving up its individuality. [G. Ed. p. 776.]

Perhaps, too, the preponderating example of the roots of the first class, which require Guna before simple radical consonants, has operated upon the roots which possess no Guna, so that ैichham and ैukṣham would be* to be regarded as regular contractions of a-ैchham, a-ैkṣham, although, owing to ichh belonging to the sixth class, and the vowel of the ukṣh class being long by position no other Guna is admitted by them.

534. In roots which begin with a, the augment and reduplication produce, in Sanskrit, an effect exactly the same as if to the root रस as ("to be") a was prefixed as the augment or the syllable of reduplication; so in both cases from a-as only ठs

* As ḍ consists of a + ṭ, and ū of a + u, so the first element of these diphthongs naturally melts down with a preceding a to ठ, and the product of the whole is di, du. In roots which begin with ri, we might regard the form ṛr, which arises through the augment, as proceeding originally not from ri, but from the original ar, of which ri is an abbreviation, as, also, the reduplication syllable of bharmi has been developed not from bhri, which the grammarians assume as the root, but from the proper root bhar (see Vocalismus, p. 158, &c.), by weakening the a to i, while in the replicated preterite this weakening ceases, and babhara or babhāra means "I bore."
can arise, and ḍsa is the first and third person of the perfect. In roots, however, which begin with i or u the operations of the augment and of reduplication are different; for iṣh, “to wish,” and uṣh, “to burn” (Latin uro), form, through the augment, ḍiṣh,* ḍuṣh, and, by reduplication, iṣh, uṣh, as the regular contraction of i-iṣh, u-uṣh. In the persons of the singular, however, which take Guna, the i and u of the reduplication-syllable pass into iy and uv before the vowel of the root, which [G. Ed. p. 777.] is extended by Guna; hence, iy-ṛṣha, “I wished,” uv-ṛṣha, “I burned,” corresponding to the plural ḍiṣhima, ḍuṣhima, without Guna.

535. In roots beginning with a vowel the tenses which have the augment or reduplication are placed, by the Greek, exactly on the same footing. The reduplication, however, cannot be so much disregarded, as to be overlooked where it is as evidently present as in the just-mentioned (§. 534.) Sanskrit ḍiṣhima, ḍuṣhima (≡i-iṣhima, u-uṣhima). When from an originally short i and u a long i and v arise, as in ḍiṅeτeνον, ḍiṅeτeνka, ḍuβριζoν, ḍuβριζma, I regard this, as I have already done elsewhere,† as the effect of the reduplication,  

* Aorist ḍiṣhisham; the imperfect is formed from the substitute ḍiṣh.
† Annals of Oriental Literature (London, 1820. p. 41). When, therefore, Krüger (Crit. Gramm. §. 99.) makes the temporal augment consist in this, that the vowel of the verb is doubled, this corresponds in regard to ḍiṅeτeνον, ḍβριζoν, ḍβριζma, ḍμιλeον, ḍμιληka, with the opinion expressed, l. c., by me; but M. Krüger's explanation of the matter seems to me too general, in that, according to it, verbs beginning with a vowel never had an augment; and that therefore, while the Sanskrit ḍsan, “they were,” is compounded of a-asan, i.e. of the augment and the root, the Greek ḍσav would indeed have been melted down from i-eσav, but the first e would not only be to the root a foreign element accidentally agreeing with its initial sound, but the repetition or reduplication of the radical vowel. Then ḍσav, in spite of its exact agreement with the Sanskrit ḍsan, would not have to be regarded as one of the most remarkable transmissions from the primitive period of the language, but the agreement would be mainly fortuitous, as ḍsan would contain the augment, ḍσav, however, a syllable of reduplication
and look upon the long vowel as proceeding from the repetition of the short one, as, in the Sanskrit इषिमा, इषिमा. For why should an त or व arise out of e + i [G. Ed. p. 778.] or न, when this contraction occurs nowhere else, and besides when eि is so favourite a diphthong in Greek, that even e + e, although of rare occurrence in the augment, is rather contracted to eि than to ए, and the diphthong ev also accords well with that language? As to ओ becoming ओ in the augmented tenses, one might, if required, recognise therein the augment, since e and ओ are originally one, and both are corruptions from a. Nevertheless, I prefer seeing in ओνोμα on the reduplication, rather than the augment, since we elsewhere find e+ ओ always contracted to on, not to ओ, although, in dialects, the ओ occurs as a compensation for on (Doric τω νόμω, τώς νόμως).

536. The middle, the imperfect of which is distinguished from the regular active only by the personal terminations, described in §§. 468. &c., exhibits only in the third person singular and plural a resemblance between the Sanskrit, Zend, and Greek, which strikes the eye at the first glance: compare ἐφερ-ε-το, ἐφερ-ο-υτο, with the Sanskrit abhar-a-ta, abhar-a-na, and the Zend bar-a-ta, bar-a-nə. In the second person singular, forms like ἔδεικ-νυ-σο answer very well to the Zend, like hu-nu-ša, “thou didst praise” (§. 469.); while in the first conjugation the agreement of the Greek and Zend is somewhat disturbed, in that the Zend, according to a universal law of sound, has changed the original termination sa after a preceding a to ha (see §. 56*.), and attached to it a nasal sound (n), but the Greek has contracted e-σο to on; thus, ἐφερού from ἐφερ-ε-σο, answering to the Zend bar-an-ha, for which, in Sanskrit, a-bhar-a-thās (see §. 469.). In the first

ablation. I should certainly, however, prefer recognising, in all Greek verbs beginning with a vowel, the reduplication alone rather than the augment alone; and from the Greek point of view, without reference to the Sanskrit, this view would appear more correct.
person singular खण्डे abhare from abhar-a-i for abhar-a-ma (see §. 471.), appears very disadvantageously compared with ἐφερ-δ-μην. In the first person plural, ἐφερ-δ-μεθα answers, in respect to the personal termination, better to the Zend bar-ά-maidhē than to the Sanskrit abhar-ά-mahi, the ending [G. Ed. p. 779.] of which, mahi, is clearly abbreviated from madhi (see §. 472.). In the second person plural, ἐφερ-ε-σθε* corresponds to the Sanskrit abhar-a-dhwam,* and Zend bar-a-dhwēm.* in the dual, for the Greek ἐφερ-ε-σθον, ἐφερ-έ-σθον (from ἐφερ-ε-πτον, ἐφερ-έ-πτην, (see §. 474.), stand, in Sanskrit, abharēthām, abharētām, from abhar-a-āthām, abhar-a-ā-tām (according to the third class abibhr-āthām, abibhr-ā-tām), and this, according to the conjecture expressed above (§. 474.), from abhar-a-thāthām, abhar-a-tātām.

"Remark.—I can quote in Zend only the third person singular and plural, the latter instanced in nipārayanta, which occurs in the Vend. S. p. 484 in the sense of a subjunctive present† (nipārayanta ἐπέμ, 'transgrediantur aquam') which, according to what has been remarked at §. 520., need not surprise us. The third person singular can be copiously cited. I will here notice only the frequently recurring ἅνα ὁ θατ, 'he spoke,' ἅνα ὁ θατα, 'he answered,' the a of which I do not regard as the augment, as in general the augment has almost disappeared in Zend (see §. 518.), but as the phonetic prefix mentioned in §. 28. But how is the remaining θατ related to the Sanskrit? The root वच vach is not used in the middle; but if it were, it would, in the third person

* From ἐφερ-ι-ττε, abhar-a-ddhwam, bhar-a-ddhwēm? see §. 474.
† Compare Burnouf, Yāṣṇa, p. 518. In Sanskrit the verb pārayāmi, mid pārayē, corresponds, which I do not derive with the Indian grammarians from the root प्र प्र, "to fulfil," but regard as the denominative of pāra, "the farther shore": this pāra, however, is best derived from vara, "the other."
FORMATION OF TENSES.

singular of the imperfect, form *avakta*, without the augment *vakta*; and hence, by changing *va* to *a + u* (for *a + v*), the Zend *avakta* might be deduced, with the regular contraction of the *a + u* to *v*.* As, in Sanskrit, the root *vach*, in many irregular forms, has laid aside *a*, and vocalized the *v* to *u*,† we might, also, for *a-vaktu*, [G. Ed. p. 780.]

* On the value of य as long य see §. 447. Note.

† As regards my explanation of the *u* which takes the place of *va* in the root *vach*, and many others, in certain forms devoid of Guna, Professor Höfer (Contributions to Etymology, p. 384), finds it remarkable that we so often overlook what is just at hand, and thinks that in the case under discussion the *u* is not to be deduced from the *v* of *va*, but that from *va* *vu* has been formed; and of this, after rejecting the *v*, only the *u* has remained. In this, however, M. Höfer has, on his part, overlooked, that the derivation of *u* from *vu* cannot be separated from the phenomena which run parallel thereto, according to which *i* proceeds from *ya* and *ri* from *ra*. It is impossible to deduce *grihyatê*, "capitur," for *grahyatê*, in such a manner as to derive *rri* from *ra*, as *vu* from *va*, and thus presuppose for *grihyatê* a *grihyatê*, and hence drop the *r*. But what is more natural than that the semi-vowels should at times reject the vowel which accompanies them, as they themselves can become a vowel? Is not the relation of the Old High German *yur*, "yor," to the Gothic *yus* founded on this? and even that of the Gothic genitive *i-zvara* to the to-be-expected *yu-zvara*? Or must from *yus* be next formed *yir*, and hence *ir* by rejecting the *y*? Can it be that the Gothic nominative *thius*, "the servant," has arisen from the theme *thiva*, not, which is the readiest way of deriving it, by the *v* becoming *u* after the *a* has been rejected, but by forming from *thiva* first *thiva*, and then, by dropping the *v*, in the nominative *thius*, and in the accusative *thiu*? I fully acknowledge M. Höfer’s valuable labours with regard to the Prākrit, but believe that, in the case before us, he has suffered himself to be misled by this interesting and instructive dialect. It is true that the Prākrit is more frequently founded on forms older than those which come before us in classic Sanskrit. I have shewn this, among other places, in the instrumental plural (§. 220.), where, however, as usual, the Prākrit, in spite of having an older form before it, has nevertheless been guilty of admitting, at the same time, a strong corruption. This is the case with the Prākrit *vuchchadi*, "dictitur." I willingly concede to M. Höfer, that this form is based
suppose a form *a-ukta* (without the euphonic contraction), and hence, in Zend, deduce, according to the common contraction, the form *ðcta*, to which *ðcta* then, according to § 28., an *a* would be further prefixed; so that in *अ*a*०*çcta* an augment would in reality lie concealed, without being contained in the initial *a*. This special case is here, however, of no great importance to us; but this alone is so, that *०*çcta, in its termination, is identical with the Sanskrit, and comes very near the Greek τo of ἐφερ-ε-τό, ἐδεικ-νυ-τό. To the latter answers the often recurring *hū-nū-ta*, ‘he praised’ (compare Greek *ὑ-μῦν*), with an inorganic-lengthening of the *u*. From the latter may, with certainty, be derived the above-mentioned second person *hū-nū-sha*, after the analogy of the aorist *υὐρὐशτα* (see § 469.). In the first person plural I have contrasted the form *bar-a-maidhē*, which is not distinguishable from the present, with the Greek ἐ-phasis-ομεθα; for it is clear, from the abovementioned (§ 472.) potential *वृद्ध्योमैद्धि* that the secondary forms are not distinguished, in the first person plural, from the primary ones: after dropping the augment, therefore, no difference from the present can exist. The form *bar-a-dhwēm* of the second person plural follows from the imperative quoted by Burnouf (Yaṣṇa, Notes, p. XXXVIII.), as *जयद्वेषम* *zayadhwēm*, ‘live ye,’ and the precative *दयाद्वेषम* *dayadhwēm*, ‘may ye give.’ * In my opinion, this form (of which more hereafter) must be taken for a precative, not for an imperative.

* In my opinion, this form (of which more hereafter) must be taken for a precative, not for an imperative.
FORMATION OF TENSES.

ORIGIN OF THE AUGMENT.

537. I hold the augment to be identical in its origin with the $a$ privative, and regard it, therefore, as the expression of the negation of the present. This opinion, which has been already brought forward in the "Annals of Oriental Literature," has, since then, been supported by Ag. Benary* and Hartung (Greek Particles, II. 110.), but opposed by Lassen. As, however, Professor Lassen will allow of no explanation whatever of grammatical forms by annexation, and bestows no credit on the verb substantive, clearly as it manifests itself in Sanskrit in many tenses of [G. Ed. p. 782.] attributive verbs, treating it like the old "everywhere" and "nowhere," I am not surprised that he sees, in the explanation of the augment just given, the culminating point of the agglutination system, and is astonished that the first ancestors of the human race, instead of saying "I saw," should be supposed to have said "I see not." This, however, they did not do, since, by the negative particle, they did not wish to remove the action itself, but only the present time of the same. The Sanskrit, in general, uses its negative particles in certain compounds in a way which, at the first glance and without knowing the true object of the language, appears very extraordinary. Thus, uttama-s, "the highest," does not lose its signification by having the negative particle $a$ prefixed to it (which, as in Greek before vowels, receives the addition of a nasal): an-uttamas is not "the not highest," or "the low," but in like manner "the highest," nay, even emphatically "the highest," or "the highest of all." And yet it cannot be denied that, in anuttama-s, the particle an has really its negative force, but anuttama-s is a possessive compound, and as, e. g., abala-s (from $a$ and bala), "not having strength," means, therefore, "weak;" so anuttama-s signifies properly "$qui$ altissimum non habet," and

* Berlin Jahrb., July 1833, pp. 36, &c.
hence, "quo nemo allior est." It might be expected, that every superlative or comparative would be used similarly, that, e. g., apunyatama-s or apunyatara-s would signify "the purest"; but the language makes no further use of this capability; it does not a second time repeat this jest, if we would so call it; at least I am unacquainted with any other examples of this kind. But what comes much nearer this use of the

[G. Ed. p. 783.] augment, as a negative particle, than the just cited an of anuttama, is this, that ēka, "one," by the prefixing negative particles, just as little receives the meaning "not one" (οὐδεὶς), "none," as वेड़ मि, "I know," through the a of a-vēd-am, gets that of "I know not." By the negative power of the augment, vēd-mi loses only a portion of its meaning, a secondary idea, that of present time, and thus ēka-s, "one," by the prefix an or na (anēka, nāika), does not lose its existence or its personality (for ēka is properly a pronoun, see §. 308.), nor even the idea of unity, inasmuch as in 6, 7, 8, &c., the idea of "one" is also contained, but only the limitation to unity, as it were the secondary idea, "simply." It would not be surprising if anēka and nāika expressed, in the dual, "two," or, in the plural, "three," or any other higher number, or also "a few," "some"; but it signifies, such is the decision

[G. Ed. p. 784.] of the use of language, "many."* It cannot, therefore, be matter of astonishment, that avēd-ām, through its negative a, receives the signification "I knew;"
and not that of "I shall know." For the rest, the past, which is irrevocably lost, forms a far more decided contrast to the present, than the future does, to which we approach in the very same proportion as we depart further from the past. And in form, too, the future is often no way distinguished from the present.

538. From the circumstance that the proper a privative, which clearly manifests a negative force, assumes, both in Sanskrit and Greek, an euphonic n before a vowel initial-sound, while the a of the augment, in both languages, is condensed with the following vowel (§. 530.), we cannot infer a different origin for the two particles. Observe, that e.g. svādhu, "sweet," as feminine, forms, in the instrumental, svādhw-ā, while in the masculine and neuter it avoids the hiatus, not by changing u into v, but by the insertion of an euphonic n (compare §. 158.). And the augment and the common a privative are distinguished in [G. Ed. p. 785.] the same way, since they both apply different means to avoid negative particles. *Vice versa*, in certain cases negation can also be expressed by a phrase for the past:

"Besen, Besen,
Seid's gewesen!"

where gewesen means the same as "now no more." Language never expresses any thing perfectly, but everywhere only brings forward the most conspicuous point, or that which appears so. To discover this point is the business of etymology. A "tooth-haver" is not yet an "elephant," a "hair-haver" does not fully express a "lion"; and yet the Sanskrit calls the elephant dantin, the lion kēzin. If, then, a tooth, danta, is derived from ad, "to eat" (dropping the a), or from dantās, "to bite" (dropping the sibilant), we may again say, "an eater or biter is not exclusively a tooth (it might also be a dog or a mouth);" and thus the language revolves in a circle of incomplete expressions, and denotes things imperfectly, by any one quality whatever, which is itself imperfectly pointed out. It is, however, certain, that the most prominent quality of the past is what may be termed the "non-present," by which the former is denoted more correctly than the elephant is expressed by "tooth-haver."
the hiatus. The division may have arisen at a period when, though early (so early, in fact, as when Greek and Sanskrit were one), the augment was no longer conscious of its negative power, and was no more than the exponent of past time; but the reason why? was forgotten, as, in general, the portions of words which express grammatical relations then first become grammatical forms, when the reason of their becoming so is no longer felt, and, *e.g.*, the *s*, which expresses the nominative, would pass as the exponent of a certain case relation only when the perception of its identity with the pronominal base *sa* was extinguished.

539. From the Latin privative prefix *in*, and our German *un*, I should not infer—even if, as is highly probable, they are connected with the *a* privative—that the nasal originally belonged to the word; for here three witnesses—three languages in fact—which, in most respects, exceed the Latin and German in the true preservation of their original state, speak in favour of the common opinion, that the nasal, in the negative particle under discussion, in Sanskrit, Zend, and Greek, is not a radical. It cannot, however, surprise us, if a sound, which is very often introduced for the sake of euphony, has remained fixed in one or more of the cognate dialects, since the language has, by degrees, become so accustomed to it that it could no longer dispense with it. We may observe, moreover, as regards the German languages, the great disposition of these languages, even without euphonous occasion, to introduce an inorganic *n*, whereby so many words have been transplanted from the vowel declension into one terminating with a consonant,

[G. Ed. p. 786.] viz. into that in *n*, or, as Grimm terms it, into the weak declension; and *e.g.*, the Sanskrit *vidhārd*, "widow," Latin *vidua*, Slavonic *vdova* (at once theme and nominative), is in Gothic, in the theme. *viduvān* (genitive *viduvān-s*), whence is formed, in the nominative, according to §. 140., by rejecting the *n*, *viduvō*. If *an* was,
in Sanskrit, the original form of the prefix under discussion, its n would still be dropped, not only before consonants, but also before vowels; for it is a general rule in Sanskrit, that words in n drop this sound at the beginning of compounds; hence, rājan, “king,” forms, with putra, rāja-putra, “king’s son,” and, with indra, “prince,” rājendra, “prince of kings,” since the a of rājan, after dropping the n, is contracted with a following i to ē (=a+i). The inseparable prefixes, however, in respect to the laws of sound, follow the same principles as the words which occur also in an isolated state. If an, therefore, were the original form of the above negative particle, and of the augment identical with it, then the two would have become separated in the course of time, for this reason, that the latter, following strictly the universal fundamental law, would have rejected its n before vowels as before consonants; the former only before consonants.

540. In §. 371. we have deduced the Sanskrit negative particles a and na from the demonstrative bases of the same sound, since the latter, when taken in the sense of “that,” are very well adapted for denoting the absence of a thing or quality or the removing it to a distance. If an were the original form of the a privative and of the augment, then the demonstrative base चन ana, whence the Lithuanian ana-s or an-s, and the Sclavonic on, “that,” would aid in its explanation. The identity of the augment with the privative a might, however, be also explained, which, indeed, in essentials would be the same, by assuming that the language, [G. Ed. p. 787.] in prefixing an a to the verbs, did not intend the a negative, nor to deny the presence of the action, but, under the a, meant the actual pronoun in the sense of “that,” and thereby wished to transfer the action to the other side, to the distant time already past; and that it therefore only once more repeated the same course of ideas as it followed in the creation of negative expressions. According to this expla-
nation, the augment and the a privative would rather stand in a fraternal relation than in that of offspring and progenitor. The way to both would lead directly from the pronoun, while in the first method of explanation we arrive, from the remote demonstrative, first to the negation, and thence to the expression of past time, as contrary to present. According to the last exposition, the designation of the past through the augment would be in principle identical with that in which, through the isolated particle स्म म, the present receives a past signification. I hold, that is to say, this म for a pronoun of the third person, which occurs declined only in certain cases in composition with other pronouns of the third person (§§ 165. &c.), and in the plural of the two first persons, where अस्में means (in the Vēda-dialect) properly “I and she” (“this, that woman”), यु-श्में, “thou and she” (§. 333.).* As an expression of past time, म, which also often occurs without a perceptible meaning, must be taken in the sense of “that person,” “that side,” “there,” as W. von Humboldt regards the Tagalish and Tongian expression for past time ना, which I have compared with

[G. Ed. p. 788.] the Sanskrit demonstrative base ना, and thus indirectly with the negative particle ना;† where I will further remark that I have endeavoured to carry back the expression for the future also, in Tongian and Madagas-carian, to demonstrative bases; viz. the Tongian ते to the Sanskrit base न त (which the languages of New Zealand and Tahiti use in the form ते as article), and the Madagascar हो to the base अ ह (§. 345.), which appears in the Tongian हे, as in the Greek ὅ, as the article.‡

* To the derivation of म, given at p. 464, Note †, it may be further added, that it may also be identified with the pronominal base स्व (see §. 341), either by considering its म as a hardened form of व (comp. p. 114), or vice versâ the व of स्व a weakening of the म of म.
† See my Treatise “On the Connection of the Malay-Polynesian Lan-guages with the Indo-European,” pp. 100, &c.
‡ L. c. pp. 101, 104.
511. No one would consider the circumstance that, in Greek, the augment appears in the form ε, but the negative particle in the form α, which is identical with the Sanskrit, as a valid objection against the original identity of relationship of the two particles; for it is extremely common in Greek for one and the same α to maintain itself in one place, and be corrupted in another to ε; as τέτυφα τέτυφε both lead to the Sanskrit tuṭ̄pha, which stands both in the first and in the third person, as the true personal termination has been lost, and only the conjunctive vowel has remained; which in Greek, except in the third person singular, appears everywhere else as α. It is, however, certain, that, from the point of view of the Greek, we should hardly have supposed the augment and the α privative to be related, as the spiritual points of contact of the two prefixes lie much too concealed. Buttmann derives the augment from the reduplication, so that ἕτυπτον would be an abbreviation of τέτυπτον. To this, however, the Sanskrit opposes the most forcible objection, in that it contrasts with the imperfect ἕτυπτοι its aṭ̄παμ, but with the [G. Ed. p. 789.] really reduplicated τέτυφα its tuṭ̄pha. The Sanskrit augmented tenses have not the smallest connection with the reduplicated perfect, which, in the repeated syllable, always receives the radical vowel (shortened, if long), while the augment pays no regard to the root, and always uses α. If i were the vowel of the augment, then in the want of a more satisfactory explanation, we might recognise in it a syllable of reduplication, because the syllables of reduplication have a tendency to weakening, to a lightening of their weight; and i, as the lightest vowel, is adapted to supply the place of the heaviest α, and does, also, actually represent this, as well as its long vowel, in the reduplication-syllable of desideratives,* and,

* Hence pipās, “to wish to drink,” for papās or pāpās, from pā, pipatish, “to wish to cleave,” for papatish, from put; so, also, bibkarni, “1 carry.”
in a certain case, supplies the place of the vowel u too, which is of middling weight, viz. where, in the second aorist in verbs beginning with a vowel, the whole root is twice given; e.g. सौनिनम् सौनिनम् for सौनिनम् सौनिनम्, from उन्, "to diminish." I cannot, however, see the slightest probability in Pott’s opinion (Etym. Forsch. II. 73.), that the a of the augment may be regarded as a vowel absolutely, and as the representative of all vowels, and thus as a variety of the reduplication. This explanation would be highly suitable for such verbs as have weakened a radical a to u or i, and of which it might be said, that their augment descends from the time when their radical vowel was not as yet u or i, but a. But if, at all hazards, the Sanskrit augment should be consi-

[G. Ed. p. 790.] dered to be the reduplication, I should prefer saying that a radical i, i, u, a has received Guna in the syllable of repetition, but the Guna vowel alone has remained; and thus avēdam for evēdam (=aiwaidam), and this from vēvēdam; abōdham for bōdham (=aubaudham), and this from bōdham.

"Remark.—According to a conjecture expressed by Höfer (Contributions, p. 388), the augment would be a preposition expressing ‘with,’ and so far identical with our ge of participles like gesagt, gemacht, as the German preposition, which, in Gothic, sounds ga, and signifies ‘with,’ is, according to Grimm’s hypothesis, connected with the Sanskrit स sa, सम sam (Greek σόν, Latin cum). Of the two forms स sa, सम sam, the latter occurs only in combination with verbs, the former only with substantives.* In order, therefore, to arrive from sam to the augment a, we must assume that, from the earliest

"I carry," for babharmi, from भर (bhrī); tishthāmi, "I stand," for tastāmi, sec §. 508.; in Greek, διωμι for δόωμι (Sanskrit dadāmi); and others.

* This seems to require qualification. Sam is found constantly in combination with substantives, as in संवस्त्र, सन्स्कृति, समन, &c. In some cases the form may be considered as derived through a compound verb, but not in all, as in the instance of sumantu.—Translator.
FORMATION OF TENSES.

period, that of the identity of the Sanskrit and Greek, the said preposition, where used to express past time, laid aside its initial and terminating sound, like its body, and only preserved the soul, that is, the vowel; while, in the common combinations with verbs, the s and m of sam have lived as long as the language itself; and while, in German, we make no formal distinction between the ge which, merely by an error, attaches itself to our passive particles, and that which accompanies the whole verb and its derivatives, as in gebären, Geburt, geniessen, Genuss. If, for the explanation of the augment, so trifling a similarity of form is satisfactory, as that between a and sam, then other inseparable prepositions present themselves which have equal or greater claim to be identified with the expression of past time; for instance, आप apa, 'from,' 'away,' and आव ava, 'from,' 'down,' off'; अल्ट ai, 'over' (atikram, 'to go over,' also 'to pass,' 'to elapse,' used of time). We might also refer to the particle अम sma, mentioned above, which gives past meaning to the present, and assume the rejection of its double consonant. It is certain, however, that that explanation is most to the purpose, by which the past prefix has suffered either no loss at all, or, if an is assumed to be the original form of the negative particle, only such as, according to what has been remarked above (§. 539.), takes place regularly at the beginning of compounds. It is also certain that the past stands much nearer to the idea of negation than to that of combination, particularly as the [G. Ed. p. 791.] augmented preterites in Greek stand so far in contrast to the perfect, as their original destination is, to point to past time, and not to express the completion of an action. We will not here decide how far, in Gothic and Old High German, an especial preference for the use of the particle ga, ge, is to be ascribed to the preterite; but J. Grimm, who was the first to refer this circumstance to the language (I. 843. 844.), adds to the examples given this remark: 'A number of
passages in Gothic, Old High German, and Middle High German, will exhibit it (the preposition under discussion) as well before the present as wanting before the preterite, even where the action might be taken as perfect. I maintain only a remarkable predilection of the particle for the preterite, and for the rest I believe that, for the oldest state of the language, as in New High German, the ge became independent of temporal differences. It had then still its more subtle meaning, which could not be separated from any tense. This observation says little in favour of Höfer's opinion, according to which, so early as the period of lingual identity, we should recognise in the expression of the past the preposition sam, which is hypothetically akin to our preposition ge. Here we have to remark, also, that though, in Gothic and Old High German, a predominant inclination for the use of the preposition ga, ge, must be ascribed to the preterite, it never possessed per se the power of expressing past time alone; for in gavasida, 'he dressed,' gavasidēdun, 'they dressed' (did dress), the relation of time is expressed in the appended auxiliary verb, and the preposition ga, if not here, as I think it is, entirely without meaning, and a mechanical accompaniment or prop of the root, which, through constant use, has become inseparable, can only at most give an emphasis to the idea of the verb. At all events, in gavasida the signification which the preposition originally had, and which, however, in verbal combinations appears but seldom (as in ga-quiman, 'to come together'), can no longer be thought of."

THE AORIST.

542. The second Sanskrit augmented-preterite, which, on account of its seven different formations, I term the multi-form, corresponds in form to the Greek aorist, in such wise, that four formations coincide more or less exactly with the

[G. Ed. p. 792.] first aorist, and three with the second. The forms which coincide with the first aorist all add s to the root,
either directly, or by means of a conjunctive vowel i. I recog-
nise in this s, which, under certain conditions, becomes र श (see §. 21. and Sanskrit Grammar, §. 101a.), the verb substantive, with the imperfect of which the first formation agrees quite exactly, only that the d of दलम, &c., is lost, and in the third person plural the termination us stands for an, thus sus for दलन. The loss of the d need not surprise us, for in it the augment is contained, which, in the compound tense under dis-
cussion, is prefixed to the root of the principal verb: the short a which remains after stripping off the augment might be dropped on account of the incumbrance caused by com-
position, so much the easier, as in the present, also, in its isolated state before the heavy terminations of the dual and plural, it is suppressed (see p. 695 G. ed.). Thus the sma of अक्षादिप-स्मा, “we did cast,” is distinguished from अक्षादिप-स्मा, “we are,” only by the weakened termination of the secon-
dary forms belonging to the aorist. In the third person plural, us stands for an, because us passes for a lighter ter-
mination than an; and hence, in the imperfect also, in the roots encumbered with reduplication, it regularly takes the place of an; hence, abibhr-us, “they bore,” for abibhr-an; and, according to the same principle, अक्षादिप-सस for अक्षादिप-
-सन, on account of the encumbering of the root of the verb substantive by the preceding attributive root.

543. Before the personal terminations beginning with t, th, and dh, roots which end with a consonant other than n, reject the s of the verb substantive in order to avoid the harsh combination of three consonants; hence, अक्षादिप-ता, “ye did cast,” for अक्षादिप-स्ता, as in Greek, from a similar euphonic reason, the roots terminating with a consonant abbreviate, in the perfect passive, the terminations σδόν, [G. Ed. p. 793.] σθε, to θον, θε; τέτυφθε, τέταξθε, for τέτυφσθε, τέταξθε: and in Sanskrit, from a similar reason, the root sthd, “to stand,” loses its sibilant, if it would come directly in contact with the prefix ut; hence ut-thita, “up-stood,” for ut-sthita.
544. For a view of the middle voice, we here give the imperfect middle of the verb substantive, which is scarcely to be found in isolated use—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SINGULAR</th>
<th>DUAL</th>
<th>PLURAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ási,</td>
<td>áswahi,</td>
<td>ásmahi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ásthás,</td>
<td>ásáthám,</td>
<td>áddhwam or ádhwam.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ásta,</td>
<td>ásátám,</td>
<td>ásata.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

545. As an example of the aorist formation under discussion, we select, for roots terminating with a vowel, नी ni, "to lead"; and, for roots ending with a consonant, क्षिप kṣip, "to cast." The radical vowel receives, in the former, in the active, प्र्द्व Vṛddhi; in the middle, only Guna, on account of the personal terminations being, on the average, heavier; in the latter, in the active, in like manner, Vṛddhi; in the middle, no increase at all,

ACTIVE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SINGULAR</th>
<th>DUAL</th>
<th>PLURAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>anáśham, aksháipsam, anáśhwa, aksháipswa, anáśhma, aksháipsma.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anáśhás, aksháipsés, anáśhtam, aksháiptám, anáśhta, aksháipta.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anáśhát, aksháipsút, anáśhtám, aksháiptám, anáśhues, aksháipsus.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MIDDLE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SINGULAR</th>
<th>DUAL</th>
<th>PLURAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>anéśhi,2 akshipsi, anéswahi, akshipswahi, anéshmahi, akshipsmahi.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anéśhás, akshipthás, anéśhátham, akshípsáthám, anéddhwam, akshíbdhwam.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anéśhá, akshipta, anéśhtám, akshípsátám, anéśhata, akshípsata.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[G. Ed. p. 794.] 1 Regarding the loss of the s, see §. 543. 2 Sh for s, see §. 21.
3 Or anéddhwam, also anédhwam, for s before the dh of the personal terminations either passes into d, or is rejected; and for dhwam, in this and the third formation, dhwam also may be used, probably from the earlier dhwam, for shdóm. 4 Regarding the loss of the n, which belongs to the personal termination, see §. 459.

546. The similarity of the middle akshipsi to Latin perfects like scripsi is very surprising; for only the aug-
ment is wanting to complete a perfect countertype of the Sanskrit form. The third person *scripsit* answers better to the active form *akṣhipsit*, which, without *Vṛiddhi*, would sound *akṣhipsit*; the Latin *vexit* (*vec-sit*) answers to the Sanskrit चवाध्वित *avākṣīt* of the same import; and again, *vexi* corresponds to the middle *avakṣīt*. The two languages have, from a regard to euphony, changed their *k* before the *s* of the verb substantive into the guttural *tenuis*, and *k* requires, in Sanskrit, श for श *s* (see p. 21). The comparison of *vexi* with *avakṣīt* may appear the better substantiated, as the second person also *vexisti* may be traced back to a middle termination; viz. to थ of *akṣhi-thās* (for *akṣhipsthās*); so that the final *s* would have been dropped, and थ have been weakened to थ. I now prefer this explanation to that according to which I have formerly identified the termination *sti* with the Sanskrit perfect termination *tha*; and in general I consider the Latin perfect, which, according to its meaning, might just as well have been called aorist, entirely independent of the Greek and Sanskrit perfect, in order that, in all its forms, I may refer it to the aorist. In this no great obstacles stand in our way; for while perfects in *si* at the first glance, shew themselves to be aorists, although not so readily by comparison with the Greek as with the Sanskrit, even *cucurri, momordi, cecini*, and similar forms, in spite of their reduplication, do not oppugn the theory of the aorist formation, and very well \[G. Ed. p. 795.\] admit of being placed beside forms like *achāchuram*, middle *achāchurē* (from *achāchurai*), from chur, "to steal," and Greek forms, as ἐπέφραδον, ἐπεφνον, of which more hereafter. They would, therefore, like the imperfect and the aorists, as *scripsi, vexi, mansi*, have merely lost the augment, and have thus been associated with the Sanskrit and Greek perfect.

547. Perfects like *śābi, vādi, lēgi, fāgi. fōdi*, exclusive of the lengthening of their vowel, might be compared with
Sanskrit aorists like अलिपः alipam, middle alipेत (from alipोई), and Greek as ἔλιπον. On account of the lengthening of the vowel, however, this comparison appears inadmissible; and I believe that, in their origin, they agree with forms like scripsi, vexi, or with such as cucurri, tutudi. In the first case, the lengthening of the vowel must pass as compensation for the s of the verb substantive, which has been dropped, on the same principle as that on which dividι from dividι, on account of the loss of the d, has lengthened its short radical vowel, or as in Greek, forms like μέλας, ἵστας, θείνυς, διδός, πός, τιθέις, in compensation for the loss of a consonant, have received an indemnification in the preceding vowel. Still closer lies the comparison with aorists like ἐφνα, ἐψηλα, εὐφράνα, ἔστελα, ἔμεινα. It is certain that the liquids, also, must, in the aorist, have originally admitted the combination with σ, and that forms like ἐφανσα (as in Sanskrit, amainsi, in Latin, mansi), ἐψαλσα, ἔστελσα, have existed, and that in these aorists the length of the vowel is in consequence of the suppression of the σ. But if Latin perfects like lęgi, fęgi, according to their origin, should fall to the Sanskrit seventh aorist formation (achųchuram, aısısilam, or aısıšlam from śil), they then contain a concealed reduplication, as, according to Grimm, do our preterites, as hiefs, Old High German hiaz (=Gothic haihait), and lęgi, scdbi, fęgi, födi, would consequently be contractions from le-egi,

[G. Ed. p.796.] sca-abi, fu-ugi, fo-odi, for lelegi, scacubi, &c., with suppression of the consonant of the second syllable, by which that of the first loses the appearance of a consonant affixed by reduplication, as is the case in the Greek γινομαι from γίγνομαι (for γι-γεν-ο-μαι), where, after removing the γ of the base syllable, the syllable γίν receives the appearance of a radical syllable, while in fact only the ν represents the root.*

* A. Benary, also (System of Roman Sounds, pp.41, &c.), explains forms
548. I must decidedly pronounce forms like cēpi, frēyi, fēci, to be reduplicated, and I have already done this, when I further recognised in them true perfects.* As perfects, they would be analogous to Sanskrit forms like तेषञ्च तेषञ्च, "we atoned," of which hereafter. As aorists, they have अनेषञ्च अनेषञ्च "I was ruined," for their prototype, which I deduce from ananiṣam, by dropping the n of the second syllable; and I refer it to the seventh aorist formation, while the Indian grammarians regard it as an anomaly of the sixth. Therefore, like अनेषञ्च अनेषञ्च from ana(n)iṣam, I regard cēpi as a contraction of cacipi, as the Latin e as a colliquiation of a+i frequently answers to the Sanskrit e; e.g. in levir, corresponding to the Sanskrit dēvar (dērai). With regard to the second syllable of the pre-supposed forms like cacipi, fafici, we may compare such perfects as cecini, tetigi, which in like manner, on account of the root being loaded with the reduplication, have weakened the radical a to i. The forms cēpi, fēci, &c., must, however, have arisen at a period when the law had not as yet been prescribed to the syllables of reduplication of replacing the heaviest vowel a by e, but when as yet the weakening of the radical vowel in the syllable of the base was sufficient. But if the previous existence of forms like cacipi, fafici, is not admitted, and cecipi, fafici, are made to precede the present cēpi, fēci, we must then

forms like fōdi, fūdi, from reduplication, but assumes the dropping of the syllable of reduplication and the lengthening of the radical syllable in compensation for its loss, against which I have expressed my opinion in the Berlin Jahrb. (Jan. 1838, p. 10); since this explanation, unlike the re-active effect of a suppression, by compensation in the preceding syllable, has no other analogous case to corroborate it.

* In my Review of Benary's System of Roman Sounds (Berlin Jahrb. i.e. p. 10). Since then, Pott, also, in his Review of the same book (in the Hall. Jahrb.) has noticed this case, but declared himself, without sufficient grounds in my opinion, against my view of the matter.
deduce cēpi from cūipi, fēci from fēici, in such wise that the first vowel absorbs the second, and thereby becomes long. just as I have already, in my System of Conjugation, deduced subjunctives like legās, legāmus, from legaīs, legaīmus. The form ēgi has this advantage over other perfects of the kind, that it has not lost a consonant between the two elements of which its ē is composed, i.e. between the syllable of repetition and that of the base: it is the contraction of a-igi or e-igi, and therefore, together with ēdi, ēmi, if the latter are likewise regarded as reduplicated forms (from e-edi, e-emi), deserves particular notice. As we ascribe an aoristic origin to the Latin perfects, we might also see in ēgi, ēdi, ēmi, a remnant of the augment.

549. I return to the second person singular in stī. If in ti, of serpisti, vexisti, cucurrīsti, cēpisti, we recognise the Sanskrit middle termination thās, and in the whole an aorist, then serpsisti does not answer so exactly to akṣhipthās for akṣhipstās as to the fourth aorist formation, which, indeed, is not used in the middle, and in roots ending with a consonant, not in the active also, but which originally can scarcely have had so confined a use as in the present state of the language; and, together with the active ayāsisham (from yā, "to go"), we might expect the previous existence of a middle, whence the second person would be ayā-sīṣṭhās, in which forms like serp-sisti are, as it were, reflected. The Sanskrit स्रष्टिः srip (from sarp), would, according to this formation, if it were used in the middle, produce aśrip-sīṣṭhās. We may notice, also, with regard to the s which precedes the t in the forms serpsisti, serpsistis, which, in § 454., has been explained as an euphonic addition, that the Sanskrit precative, which in the middle likewise unites the s of the verb substantive with the root (either directly, or through a conjunctive vowel i), prefixe another s, which is, perhaps, merely euphonic, to the personal terminations beginning with t or th, which s,
through the influence of the preceding i, becomes sh. The second person singular of the root śrip, if it were used in the middle, would be śripsīṣṭhas, to which the Latin serpsiṣṭi approaches closely, where, however, it is to be observed, that the i of the Latin serp-s-i-sti is only a conjunctive vowel, while the i of śripsīṣṭhas expresses the relation of mood. The third person singular is śripsīṣṭa, the second and third person dual, śripsīṣṭdṣṭām, śripsīṣṭdṣṭām; but the second sibilant does not extend farther; e.g. the first person plural is no more śripsīṣṭmaḥi, than, in Latin, serpsismus, but śripsimahi, like serpsimus. Yet the Sanskrit readily admits the combination śhm; for it uses, according to the third aorist formation, abōḍhiṣṭma, "we knew," middle, abōḍhiṣṭmahi.

550. In support of the opinion, that, in the second person singular of the Latin aorists, which are called perfects, a middle termination is contained, which, however, has lost sight of this origin, and passes as a common active, I will call attention to the fact, that even in Greek, in spite of its possessing a perfect middle [G. Ed. p. 799.] voice, an original middle form has, in a particular case, taken its position in the active voice; for, in the third person plural imperative, τερπόντων corresponds almost as exactly as possible to the Sanskrit middle tarpantām. In languages in which the middle, as a voice, is wanting, individual formal remnants of that voice can have been only maintained, where they fill up the place of any hiatus, which has arisen in the active, or stand beside an active termination, which has been likewise retained, bearing the same meaning as it does, and being, as it were, a variation of it; as in Irish, in the first person plural, together with the form mar (= Sanskrit mas, Latin mus, Greek μεσ), a maoid exists, which at will assumes its place, and which I have already elsewhere compared with the Zend maidūtā, and
Greek μεθα, for which the Sanskrit gives mahē, as an abbreviation of madhē (§. 472.).

551. As regards the Latin first person singular in si, in spite of the striking resemblance of forms like vexi, mansi, to the Sanskrit like avakṣhi, aṁaṁsi, the coincidence may so far be said to be accidental, as their i may be explained to be a weakening of a, so that the termination si of Latin perfects would correspond to the Greek σα of ἐλυ-σα, ετυν-σα. I am really of opinion, that the Latin forms in si do not correspond to the Sanskrit first aorist formation, but, at least for the majority of persons, to the second, which, like the Greek first aorist, inserts an a between the s of the verb substantive and the personal terminations. This a is treated nearly as, in the special tenses, the a of the first and sixth classes (see §. 109*. 1.), viz. lengthened, in the first person dual and plural, before va and ma. As, then, the a of vah-a-si, vah-a-ti, vah-a-tha, appears in the Latin veh-i-s, veh-i-t, veh-i-tis, as i, in like manner the a of vah-a-mus appears as i in veh-i-mus; so that we soon arrive at the conjecture that the i of dic-si-sti, dic-si-t, dic-si-mus, dic-si-stis, is a weakening of a, and that therefore si cor-

[G.Ed.p.800.] responds to the Greek σα, the Sanskrit sa, sā (euphonic sha, shā); thus, dic-si-mus=ἐδείκ-σα-μεν, adik-ṣhā-

ma; dic-si-stis=ἐδείκ-σα-τε, adik-ṣha-ta. The connection, therefore, between vec-si-t and the Sanskrit avāk-ṣhū-t would not be so close, as I before assumed, and for avāk-ṣhū-t we should have to imagine a form of the second formation—thus avāk-ṣha-t—in order to compare with it vec-si-t, as dic-si-t actually answers to adik-ṣha-t (Greek ἐδείκ-σε from ἐδείκ-

-σα-τε, compare ἐδείκ-σα-το). In the second person, dic-

-si-sti answers to the Sanskrit middle adik-ṣha-thās, “thou shewedst,” if the s, which precedes the t, is only of a euphonic nature, and introduced by the inclination of the t to a preceding s.
FORMATION OF TENSES.

552. But even if the Latin perfect forms in *si* are allotted to the Sanskrit second and Greek first aorist formation, still it remains most highly probable that the first person singular belongs to the middle voice; for the vowel *a* of the aorist formation under discussion is rejected in Sanskrit before the termination *i* of the first person middle; and while, according to the analogy of the imperfect, *adikṣhe* (=*adik-ṣha-i*) might be expected, instead of it is found *adikṣhi* in most exact accordance with the Latin *dic-si*. From the active form *adikṣham* it is a difficult step to the Latin *dixi*; for although, in Greek, a final *m* is sometimes entirely lost, and, for example, *edeiξα* corresponds to the Sanskrit *adikṣham*, and, in the accusative singular of bases ending with a consonant, *α* answers to the Sanskrit *am* (*πोδα*, *padam*, *pedem*), yet, in Latin, the final *m* of the Sanskrit has, in similar cases, always been retained; for example, in the first person the blunt termination of the secondary forms has been, without exception, maintained, in preference to the more full *mi* of the primary forms; thus, *dicebam*, *dicam*, *dicerem*, *dixerim*. and so it is highly probable that, in the perfect also, *dixim* would be said, if the first person was based on the Sanskrit active *adikṣham*, and not on the middle. [G. Ed. p. 801.]

It is certain that, at the period of the unity of language, the abbreviated form *adikṣhi* could not as yet have existed, but for it, perhaps, *adikṣhama* or *adikṣhamām* (=*edeiξάμην*, see §. 471.). But even these forms conduct us more readily than *adikṣham* to the Latin *dixi*,* since the first person singular in Latin has lost its termination exactly where another vowel stood after the *m*.

553. In the third person plural, the Latin *dixérunt* apparently corresponds to the Sanskrit and Greek *adikṣhan*, *edeiξαν*. It scarcely admits of any doubt, that the *r* has proceeded from *s* (as is common between two vowels), and that, therefore, in *dic-sértunt* for *dic-sésunt* (as *eram*, *ero*, for

* Cf. p. 1227 G. ed. Note †.
esam, eso), the auxiliary verb is twice contained, or is reduplicated, whether this form belongs to the Sanskrit fourth formation, where e.g. a-yā-sīthuṣ has proceeded from a-yā-sīsḥant, or, as is more probable, the third person, first on Roman ground, and after the aim and origin of the s of dic-si had been forgotten, felt the necessity for being clearly invested with the verb substantive. This distinctness, however, subsequently became indistinct. As regards this superiority of the third person plural to the other persons, it is in accordance with the phenomenon, that, in Greek, ètīde-σα-ν, ἐθε-σα-ν, are used, but not ἐτίδε-σα-μεν, ἐπίδε-σα-τε; not ἐθέ-σα-μεν, ἐθέ-σα-τε. The short termination not forming a syllable may have favored the annexation of the auxiliary verb: this reason, however, did not exist in the middle-passive; hence, ἐτίδε-ντο, not ἐτιδε-σα-ντο. The Prākrit regularly annexes, in the first person plural of the present and imperative, the verb substantive, without extending it to the second and third person, as, गच्छन्न gachchhamha (mhu from सा sma) "we go."*

[G. Ed. p. 802.] 554. To return to the Latin dixérunt, we might, instead of it, expect dixerunt, with short e, as i before r is readily replaced by ē: the long ē, however, is just as

* See p. 110, §. 109 a. (6); and comp. Lassen Institutiones Ling. Prācr., pp. 192, 335; Essai sur le Pali, p. 181; Höfer De Praer. Dial., p. 184. As Professor Lassen has, in this place, recognised the verb substantive, and been the first to remark it, although it is in like manner represented only by a single letter, it is difficult to conceive why he prefers to recognise in the s, which, in several Sanskrit, Greek, and Latin tenses, extends to all the persons of the three numbers, rather the old "everywhere and nowhere," than the verb substantive (Ind. Biblioth. III. p. 78). Such contradiction must appear to me more flattering than to hear that the verb substantive was so palpable in the places mentioned, especially in Sanskrit, that it could not escape even the most short-sighted eye. I must certainly consider it honorable to me to have perceived so long ago as the year 1816 that which astonishes Professor Lassen in 1830, whose acuteness has been so abundantly testified in other departments of Sanskrit philology.
surprising as that of dic-ē-bam for dic-i-bam; and it may be
added to what was remarked in §. 527., that the ē of legē-bam
and that of legē-runt probably rest on the same principle,
that in both forms the originally short vowel has been
lengthened, that the whole might gain more power, to
bear the appended auxiliary verb. From this principle
may also be explained the Viṛddhi increase of अक्षेपम्
akṣhāipsam, which does not prevent the assumption, that
on account of the preponderating weight of the middle
terminations, this vowel increase has been withdrawn, in
order not to make the whole too unwieldy. Remark the
case already mentioned, that the imperative termination
dhī has preserved its full form only under the pro-
tection of a preceding consonant; and in the Gothic pre-
terite all verbs which have a long vowel or diphthong
in the root, and a part of those with a before a doubled
consonant, on account of this powerful build can bear the syl-
lable of reduplication. But if only powerful [G. Ed. p. 803.]
forms can bear certain burthens, it need not surprise us,
if the language, in order to extend to its vocables the re-
quise capacity, introduces a lengthening of vowels, or
diphthongizations, which have this object alone. It is
probable that, in Sanskrit, a middle also, with āi for ī, cor-
responded to the above-mentioned akṣhāipsam (§. 544.), and
the abbreviation may have commenced, through the re-
acting influence of the personal terminations of the middle,
which were heavy at the time when no abbreviation existed
—at a period when the language was no longer conscious
that the great vowel fulness of akṣhāipsam was caused
precisely in order to afford a more powerful support for
the burthen of the auxiliary verb.

555. The formation of the aorist under discussion, in
spite of its wide diffusion in Greek and Latin, is, in San-
skrit, of but very limited use, and has been retained only
in roots in ī, śi, and ī, without, however, necessarily
belonging to those letters, or extending to all roots with these terminations, as before $s$ they all pass into $k$. On account of the $k$, according to § 21., the $s$ of the auxiliary verb is changed into $sh$; and thus $ksh$ of adikṣham, adikṣhi, "I shewed," corresponds to the Greek and Latin $x (= k's)$ of ἔδειξα, dixi.* I annex a general view of the complete conjugation of the two active forms—

**SINGULAR.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sanskrit (Active)</th>
<th>Sanskrit (Middle)</th>
<th>Greek (Active)</th>
<th>Greek (Middle)</th>
<th>Latin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>adik-ṣha-m</td>
<td>adik-ṣhi</td>
<td>ἔδεικ-σα</td>
<td>ἔδεικ-σα-μυν</td>
<td>dic-si</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adik-ṣha-s</td>
<td>adik-ṣha-thās</td>
<td>ἔδεικ-σα-ς</td>
<td>ἔδεικ-σω</td>
<td>dic-si-sti.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adik-ṣha-t</td>
<td>adik-ṣha-ta</td>
<td>ἔδεικ-σε</td>
<td>ἔδεικ-σα-το</td>
<td>dic-si-t.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DUAL.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sanskrit (Active)</th>
<th>Sanskrit (Middle)</th>
<th>Greek (Active)</th>
<th>Greek (Middle)</th>
<th>Latin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>adik-ṣha-vā</td>
<td>adik-ṣha-vahi</td>
<td>ἔδεικ-σα-μεθον</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adik-ṣha-tām</td>
<td>adik-ṣha-thām</td>
<td>ἔδεικ-σα-τον, ἔδεικ-σα-σθον</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adik-ṣha-tām</td>
<td>adik-ṣha-tām</td>
<td>ἔδεικ-σα-την, ἔδεικ-σα-σθην</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PLURAL.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sanskrit (Active)</th>
<th>Sanskrit (Middle)</th>
<th>Greek (Active)</th>
<th>Greek (Middle)</th>
<th>Latin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>adik-ṣha-n</td>
<td>adik-ṣha-nāta</td>
<td>ἔδεικ-σα-ν, ἔδεικ-σα-ντο, dic-sē-runt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 From adik-ṣha-āthām.  
2 From adik-ṣha-ātām.

556. As the Sanskrit, in its periphrastic formation of the reduplicated preterite, of which we will speak more in detail hereafter, together with kri, "to make," applies the two roots of "to be," since e.g. chōrayāṁ-āsu, like chōrayāṁ-babhāva, signifies "I" and "he stole;" so the Latin, also, for its aorist perfects, has called in the aid both of ES and FU. From FU I have already, in my System of Conjugation, derived the syllable vi, ui, of ama-vi, audi-vi, and mon-ui. I think, however, I have been wrong in com-

* The connection of dico with δείκνυμι is unacknowledged: remark the mode of expression dicis causa.
paring the v and u of vi, ui, with the f of fui. It appears better, instead of rejecting the u of fui, to assume that the f has been dropped; just as the d of duo has been lost in viginti, bis, bi (bi-pes), or as, in Tongian, ua corresponds to the New Zealand dúa, "two" (= Sanskrit dwa).

557. The u of (f)ui, according to the prevailing principle, has been changed between two vowels into v, but with a consonant preceding it is retained; hence amavi, audivi, contrasted with monui. Fui found occasion for [G. Ed. p. 805.] abbreviation in the incumbrance of the preceding principal verb, according to the same principle as that by which the first syllable of the Latin decem, decim (undecim, duodecim), has escaped the French contractions like douze, treize, or as the d of the number "ten," in several Asiatic and European-Sanskrit dialects, is weakened to r or l.*

558. The most convincing proof that in amavi, audivi, monui, the verb substantive is contained, is furnished by potui; for this form belongs to a verb, throughout which the combination with the verb substantive prevails. The tenses from ES, which are in use, select this root; thus, pos-sum (from pot-sum), pot-eram, pot-ero, pos-sim, pos-sem; but the perfect must betake itself to FU, fui; hence pot-ui, for pot-fui, which would be inadmissible. Pof-fui might have been expected, but the language preferred abandoning one of the irreconcileable consonants; and it would be difficult for any one, on account of the loss of the f, to declare the form potui, contrary to the analogy of all the other tenses, to be simple. But if pot-ui is compounded, then the application of this unmistakeable hint of the language, with regard to mon-ui, amavi, audi-vi, stē-vi, stē-vi, wo-vi, is apparent of itself. We may observe, that this vi, also, just as bam and runt (legē-bam, legē-}

* P. 447. G. ed., &c. To the same class belong the Mal. and Javan. las and Maldivian los of forms like dūa-b-las (Mal.), ro-las (Jav.), ro-los (Maldiv.), "twelve."
runt, scrips- rent), feels the necessity of being supported by
a long vowel; and hence, in place of the short vowel of sēro,
satun, sino, situm, mōveo, mōtum, exhibits a long one (com-
pare §§. 527. 554.)

559. In order that the perfects in ui, vi, may, from their
origin, appear as aorists, we must carry back the simple fui
[G. Ed. p. 806.] itself to an aorist, and this is easily done.
It is only necessary to observe the close connection between
fuit and the Sanskrit and Greek aorist a-bhūt, ἔφυ(τ). On ac-
count of its personal sign t, fuit answers less to babhūva, πέφυκε,
if the loss of the syllable of reduplication is admitted as readily
as that of the augment. I shall return hereafter to this subject.

560. The third Sanskrit aorist formation is distinguished
from the second in this, that the auxiliary verb is connected
with the root of the attributive verb by means of a conjunc-
tive vowel i. Through the influence of this i the s is changed
into sh, but is, at the same time, preserved from suppression
in those cases where the first formation, to avoid the accu-
mulation of three consonants, drops the sibilant (see §. 543.).
While, e. g., kship, in the second person plural, exhibits ak-
shipta for akshiipsta, from budh, “to know,” comes, in the
same person abdothi-xhta. On the other hand, in the third
formation in the second and third person singular active, the
sibilant is lost, and the conjunctive vowel is lengthened in
compensation, as it appears to me, for this loss; hence, abdoth-
-t-s, “thou knewest,” abdoth-t-t, “he knew,” in contrast with
abdoth-t-sham, and all the other persons. I believe I per-
ceive the ground of this solat on in this, that, as the second
and third person singular have a simple s and t for their ter-
minations, the retention of the sibilant would occasion the
forms abdothikśh (euphonie for abodhish-s), abodhish; whence,
according to a universal law of sound (see §. 94.), the last
consonant would have to be rejected. In the case before us,
however, the language preferred, for the sake of perspicuity,
rather to give up the auxiliary verb than the personal sign.
although, in the imperfect, the case frequently occurs that the second and third person singular are of the same sound, because they have lost their distinguishing mark; hence, *abibhar, avak,* signify both “thou didst carry,” [G. Ed. p. 807.] “thou didst speak,” and “he did carry,” “he did speak”; in the first case for *abibhar-*ṣḥ, *avak-*ṣḥ (*s* after *r* and *k* becomes *ṣḥ*), in the second for *abibhar-*t, *avak-*t. I annex the full formation of *abōdh-i-ṣham* and its middle, with the remark, that the radical vowel in roots ending with a consonant receives Guna in the two active forms; while roots ending with a vowel, as in the first formation, have, in the active, Vṛiddhi, in the middle, Guna; e.g. *anāviṣham, anāviṣhi,* from *un,* “to praise.”

### ACTIVE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Dual</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>abōḍh-i-ṣham,</td>
<td>abōḍh-i-ṣhwa,</td>
<td>abōḍh-i-ṣhma.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abōḍh-i-s,</td>
<td>abōḍh-i-ṣṭam,</td>
<td>abōḍh-i-ṣṭa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abōḍh-i-t,</td>
<td>abōḍh-i-ṣṭām,</td>
<td>abōḍh-i-ṣhūs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### MIDDLE.

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>abōḍh-i-ṣhi,</td>
<td>abōḍh-i-ṣhwā,</td>
<td>abōḍh-i-ṣhma.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abōḍh-i-ṣṭhās,</td>
<td>abōḍh-i-ṣṭāthām,</td>
<td>abōḍh-i-ḍhhwām.¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abōḍh-i-ṣṭa,</td>
<td>abōḍh-i-ṣṭātām,</td>
<td>abōḍh-i-ṣhāta.²</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ According to the law of sound for *abōḍhisdhwām.* ² Regarding the rejection of *n,* see §. 450., and compare Ionic forms like πεταύται.

561. The contrast of *abōḍhis, abōḍhit,* with *abōḍhisham* and all other forms combined with the verb substantive, is very remarkably in accordance with the phenomenon, that the Old Scævonic preterite, in which we have recognised the Indo-Greek aorist (see §. 255. m.), has likewise, in the second and third person singular, dropped the verb substantive, but retained it in all the other persons. But from forms like *abōḍhis, abōḍhīt,* the final consonant also, in Scævonic, must be dropped, because the Scævonic generally, according to the conjecture expressed in §. 255. 1,
THE AORIST.

[G. Ed. p. 808.] has lost all the original final consonants; hence बृदि budi, “thou didst wake,” answers to बृद्-ि-स abōdhi-ś-s, “thou didst know,” or “didst awake,” बृदि budi, “he did awake,” to बृद्-ि-ट abōdhi-ś-ṭa, “ye did awake”; and on the other hand, बृद्-ि-ट abōdhi-ś-ṭa, “ye did know,” “ye did awake.” I annex the whole for comparison, in which, however, the remarks of the following paragraphs are not to be overlooked.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SINGULAR</th>
<th>DUAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sanskrit.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Old Slav.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abōdh-i-śam,</td>
<td>būd-ich1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abōdh-ś-s,</td>
<td>būd-ś-ś</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abōdh-ś-t,</td>
<td>būd-ś-t</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Plural.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sanskrit.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abōdh-i-śma,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abōdh-i-śta,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abōdh-i-śha,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 See §. 255. m. 2 See §§. 255. m. 563.

562. The preceding comparison furnishes one of the fairest parallels which can be anywhere drawn between the Sanskrit and its European sister idioms. The agreement of the two languages, however, if we go back to their original forms, is not quite so perfect as might be at first glance believed. The i of the Slavonic būd-i-ch is, for instance, in its derivation, different from the i of the Sanskrit abōdh-i-śam; for būd-i-ṭi, “to wake,” does not correspond to the Sanskrit primitive verbs, whence abōdh-i-śam proceeds, but to the causal bōdhayāmī, “I make to know.

[G. Ed. p. 809.] bring to consciousness, wake”; on which account we have above compared (§. 447. p. 648 G. ed.) the second person present būd-i-śh-i, with bōdh-aśa-si, and in §. 505. identified the middle i of būd-i-ṭi with the character
aya of the Sanskrit tenth class, with which the causal forms agree. In spite of this, the circumstance that the Slavonic verbs in general retain their class syllables in the tense under discussion, produces, in the preterite, a remarkable similarity between such verbs as have i as the derivation-vowel and the Sanskrit third formation of the aorist, although, in fact, the Slavonic preterite belongs to the first Sanskrit aorist formation. Compare ḷa da-ch, "I gave," ḷa-ste, "ye gave," with Sanskrit forms like andī-ṣham, andī-ṣhtā: न dā, "to give," follows the fourth formation, but would form adāsam, adāsta, according to the first.

563. In the first person dual and plural the Old Slavonic inserts between the auxiliary verb and the personal character an o, as a conjunctive vowel, so that in this respect da-ch-o-va, da-ch-o-m, agree more with the Sanskrit second and Greek first aorist formation (adikṣ-ā-va, adikṣ-ā-ma, ḍeīξ-α-μεν) than with andiṣhwā, andiṣhma; but the o is not an old hereditary possession brought from the East, but a subsequent insertion to avoid the combination chv, chm. The Servian, also, which has in its preterites (in the imperfect and in the so-called simple preterite) left the sibilant of the verb substantive (where it has not been entirely dropped) in its original form, has kept free from the conjunctive vowel; as, iyrasmo, "we played." For the most part, the aorist, in Old Slavonic, is corrupted by the gutturalization of the sibilant in the first person of the three numbers. The relation to the Sanskrit in this manner becomes similar to that of the plural locative in ch to the Sanskrit in su or śu, as in ṣdva-ch = विधवासु vidhavā-su, "in the widows"; sνočha-ch = तीर्थवासु snuṣhā-su, "in the daughters-in-law"; [G. Ed. p. 810.] also similar to that of the pronominal plural genitives in ch to the Sanskrit in sām or śām, so that त्य ch, has the same relation to तेव स्त्र शu, in respect of its mutation and abbreviation, as baḥ-i-ch has to abōdh-i-ṣham.

564. In the third person plural, in Old Slavonic, instead
of sha, chd also is used, but only in the case where the preceding vowel is an a or ye, and then both sha and chd (regarding d from on see §. 463.) are used at pleasure; e. g. ماقما maqasha, or ماقما maqachd, "they anointed"; ماقما byechd or ماقما byesha, "they were."*

565. In the second and third person singular, according to Dobrowsky, instead of the forms without termination, ending with the class or root-vowel, those in the she also occur. He gives, indeed, in his first conjugation (p. 524) from glagolach, "I spoke," glagola as second and third person; but from ماقما maqach, "I anointed," he gives ماقما maqashe as second and third person, for which, in both persons, we find in Kopitar ماق maq. From the special point of view of the Sclavonic we might easily fancy we saw the personal sign in the the she of ماقما maqashe, "thou didst anoint," compared with the present ماقما mascheshi, "thou anointest," with the slight alteration of shi to she; and then assume an inorganic transfer from the second to the third person.

[G. Ed. p. 811.] As our German sind has made its way from its proper place, into the first person, or, as in Old and Anglo-Saxon, the termination of the second person plural has been imparted both to the first and third, and in the Gothic passive the third person plural has replaced both the second and first. But if, in the Old Sclavonic preterite, we have recognised the Sanskrit aorist and the euphonic law, which has destroyed all original final consonants (§. 255. l.), we easily perceive that the she of ماقما maqashe, "thou didst anoint," stands for shes, and that of ماقما maqashe, "he anointed," for shet; and

* The difference of writing the third person plural between Kopitar and Dobrowsky had escaped me in §§, 463. and 465.; the former (Glagolita, pp. 61, 62) writes ماق sha, the latter, whom I have followed, ماق sha. Though Kopitar, as I doubt not, is right, still the form sha, if it never even occurs, or very rarely, is so far the elder, as the y of syya is to be considered an inorganic prefix, as in many other forms (see §. 255. n.).
that this she(s), she(t), of the second and third person rests on the Sans. sis, sit, of the above-mentioned akṣhāipis, akṣhāipit (§. 545.). I do not say on shas, shat, of adik-šas, adik-šat =ēdeik-σας, ēdeik-σε, (p. 782); for although the termination of माजाहि maङśa-he is nearly identical with that of ēdeik-σε, still the second person plural माजावषे maङḍaste (not माजाहिते maङ्छाहिते) teaches us that the Slavonic aorist formation belongs to the Sanskrit first, not to the second (=Greek first).

566. I believe, too, that forms like the above-mentioned bādi, “thou didst wake,” “he did wake,” originally had another syllable she after it; thus bādi from bādishe; nese, “thou didst bear,” “he bore,” from neseshe; as in Servian all imperfects in the second and third person singular actually terminate in she. But in the said dialect the Sanskrit aorist has split into two tenses, of which one is called in Wuk’s Grammar (translated by J. Grimm) “imperfect,” the other “simple preterite.” The former carries the sibilant of the verb substantive, in the form of m sh or c s, through all the persons, with the exception of the first person singular and third plural; the latter has entirely lost it in the singular, but exhibits it in the plural also, in the third person. I annex for comparison the two tenses of इरणम iγram, “I play,” in full.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMPERFECT.</th>
<th>SIMPLE PRETERITE.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SINGULAR.</td>
<td>SING.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iγra,</td>
<td>iγra,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iγrashe,</td>
<td>iγrashe,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iγrashe,</td>
<td>iγra,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iγra,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

567. The Bohemian has a remnant of the preterite

* The sign * occurs, according to Wuk, in syllables “in which the tone terminates roundly.” Remark that in the first person singular and second person plural the simple preterite is distinguished from the imperfect simply by the absence of this accent.
corresponding to the Sanskrit aorist, in the tense designated by Dobrowsky as the imperfect of the optative, in which bych, which is distinguished from the Old Sclavonic य च byech, "I was," only by a different form of the radical vowel, in combination with the past participle byl, (thus byl-bych) expresses the idea, "I were," or "would be." If the participle preterite follow a second time this byl-bych, this forms the pluperfect of this mood, and bylbych byl signifies "if I had been," or "I would have been." Compare the conjugation of byl-bych (feminine byla-bych, neuter bylo-bych), or rather that of bych alone, with that of the Old Sclavonic य च byech, "I was."

**BOHEMIAN.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SING.</th>
<th>PLURAL.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>bych,</td>
<td>bychom,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bys,</td>
<td>byste,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by,</td>
<td>by,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OLD SCLAVONIC.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SING.</th>
<th>PLURAL.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>byech,</td>
<td>byechom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bye,</td>
<td>byeste.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bye,</td>
<td>byeshu (byeshyn).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"Remark.—The second person singular bys has the advantage over the Old Sclavonic bye of retaining the sibilant of the auxiliary verb, while in the third person [G.Ed. p. 813.] plural, य श य ayesha, has, in this respect, the advantage over by. From the Bohemian, as our point of view, the s of bys can only mark a personal termination, particularly as s in Bohemian actually expresses the second person. According to that, however, which was previously remarked regarding the she which occurs in Servian, and occasionally, also, in Old Sclavonic, in the second and third person singular, it can admit of no doubt that the s of bys is identical with that of the second person plural byste, and that it has preserved the first, and not the second sibilant of the Sanskrit singular persons, like ṛṣṭiśitaś, and śhīs, p. 793 G. ed. The root भु bhu, ‘to be,’ according to the first aorist formation, would, in the second person
singular, form abhdushhēs, and, without Vriddhi, abhāyhiṅ, the middle part of which is contained in the Bohemian bys."

568. The Old Sclavonic dach, "I gave," and analogous formations, remind us, through their guttural, which takes the place of a sibilant, of the Greek aorists ēδωκα, ἐθηκα, ἦκα. That which, in Old Sclavonic, has become a rule in the first person of the three numbers, viz. the gutturalization of an original s, may have occasionally taken place in Greek, but carried throughout all the persons. No conjecture lies closer at hand, than that of regarding ēδωκα as a corruption of ēδωσα, whether it be that the σ has with one step passed into κ, or that a κ has placed itself beside the sibilant of the verb substantive, as in the imperfect ἐσκον, ἐσκε, in the old Latin future escit, and in the imperfects and aorists in ἐσκον, ἐσκομην, ἄσκον, ἄσκομην, as δινείεσκε, καλέ- εσκον, καλέσκετο, ἐλασκε, δασάσκετο, in which the accession of the verb substantive is not to be overlooked, which therefore is doubly contained in the forms in σα-σκον, σα-σκομην. But in ēδωκα, ἐθηκα, ἦκα, it being presupposed that they were formerly ēδωσκα, &c., only the euphonic accompaniment of the σ would have remained, and thus an original ēδωσα would have next become ēδωσκα and then ēδωκα. Perhaps, also, a κ may have originally been prefixed to the σ of the to-be-presupposed ēδωσα, as in ξίνυ from σίν = Sanskrit sam, "with"; so that thus ēδωκα would be an abbreviation of ēδωξα, as perhaps a form τομ [G. Ed. p. 814.] preceded the Latin cum if it is akin to ξίνυ, σίνυ, सम sam.

569. The Lithuanian also presents a form which is akin to the Greek and Sanskrit aorist, in which, as it appears to me, k assumes the place of an original s; I mean the imperative, in which I recognise that Sanskrit mood which agrees with the Greek optative aorist, and through which, therefore, the k of dûk, "give," dûkite. "give ye" (Sanskrit dāsīdhwam, "may ye give," preceptive middle), is connected with the k of the Greek ēδωκα. But
if, then, the κ of ἑδωκά, ἑθηκά, ἥκα, has either, as I prefer to assume, directly, or through the medium of σκ or ξ, proceeded from σ,* then there is no difficulty in deducing also the κ of perfects like δὲδωκα from σ, and therefore from the verb substantive, although the Sanskrit in this sense refrains from combining with the root as. But fundamentally all tenses have an equal claim to this root, to express the copula, and if, in Greek, imperfects like ἑδιδων, and aorists like ἑδων, in the third person plural, combine with the verb substantive, while the Sanskrit forms adadām, adām, remain simple; and if, further, the Greek dialectically combines the imperfect ἑςκον with the imperfects of attributive verbs, and the Latin here uses its bam, while the Sanskrit imperfects nowhere receive the verb substantive, it cannot surprise us if the Greek restores that in the perfect which the Sanskrit has neglected. The incumbrance of the root, which occurs in the perfect through reduplication, is not favorable to the reception of the verb substantive; and the Greek also admits the addition of the κ only there where the least difficulty exists, viz. after vowels and the lightest consonants, the liquids; thus, δὲδωκα, indeed, πεφιληκα. ἑφθαρκα, ἕσταλκα, πέφαγκα, but not τέτυπκα, πέπλεκκα: but, in order to avoid the harshness of this combination, the κ of the auxiliary verb is changed to ὧ, as it were in the spirit of the German law for the mutation of sound,† and this, with the preceding tenuis or medial, is changed to an aspirate;

* Regarding the reverse case, the transition of gutturals into σ, see §.601.

† See §.87. In the Malay-Polynesian languages, also, mutations of tenuis into aspirates occur; for example, ḥ for k and ф for p. In the language of Madagascar, also, ts for t, as in German z instead of the aspirate of t; as futsi, “white,” corresponding to the Malay pūti and Sanskrit pūta, “pure,” of the same meaning. See my Treatise on the Connection of the Malay Polynesian Languages with the Indo-European, Remark 13.
thus, τέτυφα for τέτυφ’α from τέτυφ-κα, πέπλεξα for πέπλεκ’α from πέπλεκκα. On the other hand, in T-sounds the language has preferred dropping these entirely before κ, and leaving the κ in its full right and possession; thus, ἐψευκα, πέπεικα, for ἐψευδκα, πέπειθκα. The passive, on account of its heavy terminations, is less favorable to the reception of the auxiliary verb. And as, together with ἐδίδοσαν, ἐδοσαν, no forms ἐδιδόσαντο, ἐδόσαντο, exist, so to the active perfects in κα no passives in καμαί (or σαμαί, with the original sound preserved) correspond. It might, however, be assumed, that the σ, which has remained in forms like τετέλεσμαι, ἐσπασ-μαι, ἕνασμαι, especially after short vowels, sometimes also after long ones (ἕκουσμαι), is not euphonic, but belongs to the verb substantive; for it is assuredly treated precisely like the σ which takes the place of a radical T-sound (ἐψευσ-μαι, πέπεισ-μαι) and is only dropped before another σ (πέπεισ-σαι, ἕκουσ-σαι). In verbs in ν, the ν and σ contend to a certain degree for the honor of being retained: πέφανσμαι would be an impossibility in the present state of the language, but πέφα-σμαι has obtained currency in preference to πέφαμ-μαι (as ἐξηραμμαι and others); while in the third person πέφαν-σαι has carried off the victory from πέφα-σται, perhaps under the protection of πέφαν-σαι, [G. Ed. p. 816.] which necessarily gained the preference over πέφα-σται, a form repugnant to all custom, and over πέφα-σαι, in which the ν would have been unnecessarily abandoned. The circumstance that verbs of this kind exhibit the σ also in the formation of words, before suffixes which begin with μ or τ (τέλεσμα, τελεστής), is no argument against the opinion that the σ in the perfect passive has more than a euphonic foundation; for without deriving such words from the perfect passive, still the custom of writing σμ, στ, which have good foundation in the perfect passive, may have exerted an influence on such forms, in which the σ before μ and τ can only appear as an idle or euphonic accompaniment.
570. That aorist formation, to which, in my Sanskrit grammar, I have assigned the fourth place, is of less importance for comparison with the European cognate languages, but deserves notice on this account, that it makes the verb substantive so broad that it cannot be overlooked; for in forms like ayā-sīṣham, "I went," it receives the word in its broadest extent, and exhibits its radical consonants in a double form; and so in the other persons, with the exception of the second and third singular, in which we have ayā-sīs, ayā-sīt, for ayāsik-s, ayāsīṣht, on the same ground on which, in the third formation, abōdhās, abōdhīt, are used, completely passing over the auxiliary verb (see §. 560.). The full conjugation of ayāsīṣham is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SINGULAR</th>
<th>DUAL</th>
<th>PLURAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ayā-sīṣham,</td>
<td>ayā-sīṣha,</td>
<td>ayā-sīṣhma.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ayā-sīs,</td>
<td>ayā-sīṣta,</td>
<td>ayā-sīṣṭa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ayā-sīt,</td>
<td>ayā-sīṣṭam,</td>
<td>ayā-sīṣṭa.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[G.Ed. p.817.] 571. This aorist formation is not used in the middle, or has fallen into disuse; probably because the broad form of the auxiliary verb accorded just as little with the heavier middle terminations, as in Greek the syllable σα of ἐδίδο-σα-ν, ἔδο-σα-ν, with the passive ἐδίδο-ντο, ἔδο-ντο. The active also, in Sanskrit, avoids this formation in roots which are encumbered with a final consonant, with the exception of three roots in m: ram, "to play," nam, "to bend," yam, "to restrain." As, however, m before s must pass into the very weak nasal sound of Anuswāra (ṅ), which, in comparison with other consonants, is almost nothing, the forms, therefore, araṁ-sīṣham, anaṁ-sīṣham, ayaṁ-sīṣham, come, in respect to the weight of the root, very near to forms like ayāsīṣham.

"Remark.—If it is asked, in what way the language has arrived at the form sīṣham, two modes of deriving it present themselves. Either, as I have before assumed,
is a syllable of reduplication, and šham (properly sam, the s of which, through the influence of a preceding i, becomes šh) the principal syllable; or sišham was originally sasam; sišhua, šaswa or sāswa; and sišhma, sasma or sāsma, &c.; and these forms have been so developed from the second aorist formation, corresponding to the Greek first (see §. 555.); that to the verb substantive, which already existed accompanied by a, the same attached itself a second time, preceding the personal terminations (probably at a time when the auxiliary verb was no longer recognised as such); just as in Latin third persons plural, like serpserunt from serpserunt. From sāva, sāma (adikšhāva, adikšhāma, ēdei-ξαμαυ), would consequently next be formed sāswa, sāsma; from satam, sata (adikšhatam, adikšhata, ēdeιξαυν, ēdeιξατε), would come sastam, sasta. But subsequently, after the a and a of the first syllable had, in order to lighten the weight, become i, the following s necessarily became šh; thus, dual sišhua, sištam, sišhām, from sāswa, sāstam; and, in the first and second person plural, sišhma, sištā, from sāsma, sasta. The root शाच् sās, 'to rule,' in some persons affords us an excellent prototype or counterpart of this process of corruption. It weakens, viz. before the heavy personal terminations beginning with mutes (not, however, before the weak v and m) its a to i, and consequently must also change [G. Ed. p. 818.] its final s into šh, and a following t, th, into t, th; and exhibits, therefore, in the dual, sištam, sišthām, instead of sāstam sāstām, in the plural, sištha for sāsta. In the third person plural the appended auxiliary verb under discussion exhibits the termination us for an; thus, aydsišhus for aydsišhan, as might be expected according to the analogy of adikšhan, ēdeιξαυ. The replacing of the termination us by an is easily explained by considering that us passes as a lighter termination than an (§. 462.), and that, on account of the doubling of the auxiliary verb, occasion arises for lightening the word in every other manner possible.
The root ‘śās, too, which is so liable to be weakened, selects, in the third person plural of the imperfect, the termination us for an; thus ‘śās-us, corresponding to the second person ‘śiś-ta. If, then, as I scarce doubt, the aorist form in ‘siśham, &c., has arisen in this way, that the auxiliary verb has been re-attached to itself, being first simply combined with the root; then this form in principle corresponds with the Ionic aorist-forms like ἐλάσασκε (for ἔλασε from ἔλασσα), ἀσάσκετο for ἔδάσατο. The dropping of the augment in these aorists and similar imperfects is clearly occasioned by the new burthen which has been attached; and we might therefore, in Latin also, ascribe the dislodgement of the augment to the circumstance (or find it promoted thereby), that all imperfects and perfects (aorists) of attributive verbs, according to what has been before remarked, are or were encumbered with an auxiliary verb (ham, si, vi, ui), or a syllable of reduplication, either visible or concealed by subsequent contraction (cucurri, ἑπὶ).

In the isolated and unsupported ‘crum for ‘ram = ज्ञातम् ‘dsam, the augment was laid aside by the simple abbreviation of the vowel.

572. In Zend, those aorist forms which unite the verb substantive with the root, are of rare use, but are not entirely wanting. The only instance which I can cite is, however, the form μᾶμμα ‘manista, “he spoke” (Vend. S. p. 132), a middle of the first formation, corresponding to the Sanskrit आम्भि ‘amanista, “he thought,” from the root man, which, in Zend, has assumed the meaning “to speak,” and has also produced the substantive तः ‘maithra, “speech.” The frequently-occurring μᾶμ्म ‘dāla, “he gave,” is not, as might be imagined, an aorist, but is based as imperfect

[G. Ed. p. 819.] on the Sanskrit अद्धि adatta (from adud-ta for adadd-ta=‘dīdoro), since, according to §. 102. (end), the first t must be changed into ś.

573. We now pass on to those formations of the San-
skrít aorist, which are known in Greek under the name of the second. To this class belong, according to the arrangement of my Sanskrit grammar, the fifth, sixth, and seventh formations. The fifth annexes the personal terminations direct to the root, and is distinguished from the imperfect only by the removal of class characteristics; thus as, in Greek, ἡδων is distinguished from ἡδίδων; so, in Sanskrit, addám is distinguished from adadām (see p. 674); and in Zend, where, too, this kind of aorist formation is in like manner found, ḍādām from ḍadhanām (regarding dh for d, see §. 39.). To the Greek ἔστη, ἔστης, ἔστη, ἀοχαύ ὀσθᾶμ, ἀοχαύ ὀσθᾶς, ἀοχαύ ὀσθᾶτ, correspond, in opposition to the reduplicated, but, in the radical vowel, irregularly shortened ἀτिशθᾶμ, ἀτισθᾶς, ἀτισθᾶτ (see §. 508.). The relation of the Greek ἔθην to ἔτιθην corresponds to that of adhām to adadāhām (from dhā), “to lay,” “to place.” The Greek ἔφυ-ν, ἔφυ-ς, ἔφυ-(τ), have the same relation to ἔφυ-ο-ν, ἔφυ-ε-ς, ἔφυ-ε, that the Sanskrit abhāv-am, “I was” (not abhā-m, see §. 437. Rem.), abhā-s, abhā-t, have to abhāv-ā-m, abhāv-ā-s, abhāv-ā-t, since bhā, as belonging to the first class, assumes, in the special tenses, an a, but withdraws it in the aorist, as the Greek does its o, e.

574. The Latin fui, which, like all perfects, according to what I have before remarked (see §§. 546. &c.), I regard as originally an aorist, diverges from the corresponding form of the Sanskrit and Greek, by the assumption of a conjunctive vowel i, and thus corresponds to the sixth formation; hence fu-ī-sti* for abhā-s, ἔ-φυ-ς, [G. Ed. p. 820.] or rather for the Sanskrit middle form a-bhā-thās; for although the fifth formation is not used in the middle, and no adā-ta, as-thā-ta, adhā-ta, correspond to the Greek ἔδω-το, ἔστα-το, ἔθε-το, still it may be presumed that they were originally in use. In the third person, fu-ī-t, stands for

Respecting the s of fu-ī-sti, fu-ī-stis, see §. 549.
abhít, ēphv; in the plural, fu-i-mus for abhú-ma, ēphv-µev; fu-i-stis for abhú-ta, ēphv-re, If this aorist formation were employed in Sanskrit in the middle also, the first person singular would be abhúv-i,* and, without euphonic permutation of sound, abhú-i. To the former the obsolete fuvī corresponds; to the latter, fu-i. I do not, however, place any weight on this surprising accordance; for although fuvī is based on a middle form (the m of abhúvam would probably have been retained, see §. 431.), still it is certain that, in Sanskrit, the termination of the first person singular middle, before the division of languages, had not yet fallen into the abbreviated condition in which we now see it; and, according to the analogy of the presupposed third person, abhú-ta, in place of abhúv-i, abhú-ma, (from abhúmam or -máám, see §. 552.), must have existed. I do not, therefore, regard the i of fu-i as identical with the Sanskrit i of the pre-supposed abhúvī, but as identical with the conjunctive vowel i of fu-i-sti, fu-i-t, &c. Consequently, the form fu-i, just like present forms, e.g. vēh-o = vah-a-mi, is entirely deficient in a personal termination.

575. The sixth Sanskrit aorist formation is distinguished from the fifth simply by this, that the personal terminations [G. Ed. p. 821.] are united with the root by a conjunctive vowel a, and this a is treated in conjugation exactly like the class vowel of the first and sixth class (§. 109a. 1.). This aorist, therefore, is distinguished from the imperfect of the first class simply by the withdrawal of the Guna; e.g. the imperfect of rish, "to injure," class 1, is arēsh-a-m (= araişham), and the aorist arisht-a-m. We have, therefore, here the relation of the Greek ἔλειπ-o-v to the aorist ἔλειπ-o-v, which is

* The common rule would require abhuvī (with a short u), but bhū has this property, that before vowels it becomes bhuv: hence, in the first person singular, abhuv-am, and in the third plural abhuv-an; in the first and third person singular of the reduplicated preterite buhbhūva stands irregularly for búbhāv-a,
without Guna. From *budh*, “to know,” class 1, comes the imperfect *abādh-a-m* (=*abaudh-a-m*), and the aorist *abudh-a-m*, just as, in Greek, from *ΦΥΓ, ἔφευγ-ο-ν* opposed to *ἔφυγ-ο-ν*.

576. In the Sanskrit sixth class, which has a as its class-vowel in common with the first, but does not admit of Guna in the special tenses, which would have to be withdrawn in the aorist, the formation under discussion is possible only in a small number of irregular verbs, which, in the special tenses (see § 109*. 1.) insert a nasal, and again reject it in the aorist, as generally in the common tenses. Thus *lip*, which has been repeatedly mentioned, “to smear” (compare ἀλείφω), forms, in the imperfect, *alimpam*, and in the aorist *alipam*. Another form of this kind is *alupam*, “I did cut off,” in contradistinction to *alumpam* (compare the Latin *rumpo, rupi, ruptum*). The same is the relation of Greek aorists like *ἐλαβον* (Sanskrit *labh, “to obtain”), ἔχαδον, ἐλαθον, to their imperfects ἐλάμβανον, ἔχανδανον, ἐλάνθανον, only that these, besides the inserted nasal, have also another external addition, which is likewise rejected, as, in Sanskrit, the fifth and ninth classes reject their intermediate syllable *nu, nd*. As to the imperfect *asak-nav-am* and the aorist *asak-a-m*, which, in Sanskrit, come from *śak, “to be able,”* class five, these two forms stand in a relation to one another similar to that in which the Greek passive aorists *ἐξέγην, ἐμίγην, ἐπάγην*, stand to their imperfect actives [G. Ed. p. 822.] ἐξεύγνυν, ἐμίγνυν, ἐπήγνυν; and as for the imperfect *akliś-nā-m*, and the aorist *akliś-a-m*, which come from *kliś*, class nine, this corresponds exactly to the relation of the Greek *ἐθάμ-νη-ν* to *ἐθαμ-ο-ν*. From *swid, “to sweat,”* class four, come the imperfect *aswid-ya-m*, and the aorist *aswid-a-m*: here the relation is similar to the correspondence of an aorist *ἐβαλ-ο-ν*, in Greek, to the imperfect *ἐβαλλον*, it being pre-supposed that the gemination of *βάλλω* is the conse-

* If we assume in βάλλω the mutation of an original tenuis to its medial
quence of an assimilation (see § 501.), and that therefore 
\( \beta \alpha \lambda \lambda \omega \) has arisen from \( \beta \alpha \lambda \gamma \omega \), as \( \epsilon \alpha \lambda \lambda \alpha \gamma \) from \( \alpha \lambda \gamma \alpha \).

577. In roots which end with vowels this aorist formation is, in Sanskrit, little used, and where it occurs the radical vowel is rejected before the vowel of conjunction, with the exception of \( \chi \) \( r \iota \) and \( \chi \) \( \iota \iota \), of which the former becomes \( \alpha r \), the latter \( \iota r \): e.g. \( a s a r - a - m \), \( a j \iota r - a - m \), from \( \chi \) \( s r \) (originally \( s a r \)), “to go,” \( \chi \) \( j \iota \iota \) (properly \( j a r \), \( j \iota r \)), “to grow old,” \( a s w - a - m \), from \( s w i \), “to grow.” Roots in \( u \) and \( \dot{u} \) do not occur in this aorist formation; otherwise from \( b h \dot{d} \), “to be,” if it followed this formation, and in like manner rejected its vowel, would come \( a b h \alpha m \), \( a b h \alpha s \), \( a b h \alpha t \), which would approach the Latin \( b a m \) of \( a m a - b a m \) very closely; or, if the \( \dot{u} \) were not rejected, but, according to § 574., changed into \( \dot{u} v \), or, according to the general law of sound, into \( u v \), then, in respect to the conjunctive vowel, in the third person singular the Latin \( f u - i - t \), and, in

\[ [G. Ed. p. 823.] \] 
the first person plural, \( f u - i - m u s \), would have the same relation to \( a b h u u v - a - t \), \( a b h u u v - \dot{a} - m a \), or \( a b h \dot{a} u u v - a - t \), \( a b h \dot{a} u u v - \dot{a} - m a \), that, as above (§ 507.), \( v e h - i - t \), \( v e h - i - m u s \), have to \( v a h - a - t i \), \( v a h - \dot{a} - m a s \).

578. In Zend it is hardly possible to distinguish everywhere with certainty the aorist formation under discussion from the imperfect, at least not in examples of the kind like the frequently-occurring \( z a n a t \), “he struck.” This form may be regarded as an aorist, because the root \( h a n \) \( h a n \), to which the Zend \( \mu \gamma z a n \) (for which also \( \mu \gamma \), \( j u n \)) corresponds, belongs to the second class; and therefore, in the second and third person singular, the imperfect forms

medial, as, \( v i c e v e r s e d \), in \( p i y o = b u d d \), “to know,” a tenuis stands in place of a medial, then \( \beta \alpha \lambda \lambda \omega \) would be referable to the Sanskrit root \( p a d \), whence \( p a d y \), “I go” (middle), assuming a causal meaning. As regards the weakening of the \( d \) to \( l \), BAA answers, in this respect, to the Prākṛt \( p a l \). The same may be said of \( \pi \alpha \lambda \lambda \omega \), where the initial sound presents no difficulty.
ahān for ahains, ahant, according to § 94. In Zend, also, this root prevails chiefly in the second class. We find in the Vend. S. p. 158. &c. repeatedly jāinti, "he beats," also zaintē (p. 157, perhaps erroneously for zainti, or it is a middle); but at p. 177 we find ṭombyejanaiti, according to the first class, and therefore ṭombye zanat also may be allotted to the first class, and regarded as the imperfect. But although zanat should be explained as belonging to the class to which this verb is principally referable, it may be still regarded as the imperfect, and, in fact, as following the analogy of the Sanskrit सरोदत arddat, "he wept," and the Zend ṭombye anhat, "he was" (see § 532.).

579. The Sanskrit seventh aorist formation is distinguished from the sixth by a syllable of reduplication preceding the root, and therefore answers to the Greek aorists, as ἐπεβνων, ἐπέφραδν, ἐκέκλετο, and such as have dropped the augment, as τέτυκων, πέπιθον. We have already adduced above (§ 546) Latin perfects like cucurri, tutudi, cecini, and remarked, that such as cēpi, frēgi, fēci, and probably also such as lēgi, fūdi, scābi, vūdi, fūyi, (if in the latter the length of the vowel is not to be regarded as compensation for an s, which has been dropped after the final consonant of the root,) contain a concealed reduplication (see §§ 547, 548). The Sanskrit apaptam, [G. Ed. p. 824.] "I fell"(*), for apapatam, from pat, "to fall," corresponds exactly to the above-mentioned Greek ἐπεβνων in its entire structure, and therefore, also, in the rejection of the radical vowel. While the Greek reduplicates this root in the present and imperfect, and withdraws the reduplication in the aorist, so that the Doric ἐπετον (commonly ἐπεσον) has the same relation to ἐπιπτεν that ἐδων, ἐβην, ἐστην, have to ἐδίδων, ἐτίθην, ἐστην, the Sanskrit, with this verb, adopts the reverse method, and opposes to the imperfect apatam an aorist

* See my lesser Sanskrit Grammar, § 382., Remark.
apaptam. The Greek imperfect, therefore, ἐπιτοῦ, corresponds most surprisingly with this aorist apaptam, and the Greek aorist ἐπετοῦ with the Sanskrit imperfect apatam.

580. In Sanskrit all verbs of the tenth class follow this seventh aorist formation, and, which is the same thing, all causal forms, for these are in their formation identical with the tenth class. And here the rhythmical law is valid, that either the syllable of reduplication, or the base-syllable, must be long, whether by natural length of the vowel or by position, as in apaptam. Both kinds are often at will admissible in one and the same root, but in most cases the use of language has exclusively decided for one or the other kind, and, in fact, most frequently for the length of the syllable of reduplication; e.g. from śīl, “to make,” comes aśīśālam or aśīśīlam; from chur, “to steal,” comes ačāchuram.

581. Besides the verbs of the tenth class and causal forms, as the above-mentioned apaptam, and some others to be given in the following paragraphs, only four other roots ending with a vowel belong to this class, viz. sṛi, “to go,” świ, “to grow,” “to go,”* dru, “to run,” sru, “to hear,” snu, “to flow,”† whence aśiśriyam, aśiświyam, adudruvam, aśuśruvam, asusnuvam.

582. I have already remarked (§. 548.) that anēśam, “I went to ruin,” from naś, in my opinion contains a concealed syllable of reduplication, and has arisen from ananīśam (for ananāś-a-m) by rejection of the second n; and, moreover, that Latin perfects like cēpi rest on the same principle. In अवोऽचाम avōcham, also, “I spoke,” I

* These two roots may be originally identical, as semi-vowels are easily interchanged (see §. 20.), and the Latin cres-co may be referred to one or the other.
† This is connected with sru, “to flow,” by the affinity of the liquids compare the Greek νεω, νεύ-σομαι; ῥεω, ῥεύ-σομαι.
recognise a reduplication, though it appears that the 6 is only an alteration of the a of the root. The root vach has, however, a tendency to suppress its radical vowel and vocalize its v: hence, in the participle passive, ukta, and in the plural of the reduplicated preterite ûch-i-ma, from u-uchima. If, then, it is assumed that in the aorist formation under discussion the root vach has been contracted to uch, then vôch may very satisfactorily be deduced from va-uch for vavach. The syllable of reduplication, therefore, has in this form, with regard to gravity, carried off the superiority over the base-syllable, as in forms like achûchuram, “I stole.” Whether the Zend ʋaνχvàνχ vâdchêm, “I spoke,” the third person of which, vaôchat, occurs very frequently, is identical with the Sanskrit avócham, and therefore, in like manner, reduplicated, cannot be decided with certainty, for this reason, that, as Burnouf has shewn, the Zend has a tendency to change an a, through the influence of a preceding v, into û 6, and thus to make it more homogeneous to the nature of the v; but, according to §. 28., an a is prefixed the û 6. A present middle, also, ʋâνχvâνχ vôchê, occurs in Zend *, and a potential (optative) ʋâνχvâνχ vâchûit (Vend. S. p.163), [G. Ed. p. 826.] which might, however, also be regarded as aorist of the potential.

583. In arandham, also, “I injured,” “I slew,” from the root radh, I think I discover a reduplication,† assuming an

* Vend. S. p.83: tat vachô vahôctê, “this speech I speak.” Or should vahôctê be considered a reduplicated preterite? It is certain that Anquetil is wrong in regarding it as the imperative, and translating the passage by “prononcez bien cette parole.”

† This root may be akin to vadh, “to beat,” “to slay” (see §. 20.), to which A. Benary has referred the Latin laedo, which, therefore, would be also connected with radh, and stands nearer to the latter, as r and l are almost identical.
exchange of the liquids; thus, arandham for arardham, from araradham, as apaptam from apapatam. With regard to the exchange of the $r$ for $n$, it may be proper to advert to the Tongian nima, "five," in opposition to rima, lima, of the dialects near akin. Observe, also, that in the intensive forms चंचल chanchal and चंचुर chanchur,* the nasal of the syllable of reduplication is the representative of the $l$ and $r$ of the root, just as of the $\mu$ of the Greek πίμπλημι, πίμπρημι, where, therefore, $\mu$ for $\lambda$ stands in the reverse relation of the Latin flare for the Sanskrit ठ ठ� dhmā.

584. In verbs which begin with a vowel the whole root is, in Sanskrit, in this aorist formation, twice employed, and the first time, indeed, uniting the radical vowel with that of the augment, according to the principle of §. 530, in accordance, therefore, with the Greek aorists with Attic reduplication, as ἥγαγον, ὁροποί. The Sanskrit, however, requires, in the second annexation of the root, the lightest vowel of all, $i$,

[G. Ed. p. 827.] as the representative of all the rest. Not only, therefore, are $i$ and the diphthong $e$ ($a + i$) shortened to $i$, and, e. g., from ēday (causal from ēḍ, "to praise") dididam formed, but $a$ and $ā$ also are weakened to $i$, after the principle of Latin forms like tetigi, contingo, where the encumbrance of the root by the syllable of reduplication or the preceding preposition is the occasion of the vowel being weakened. Hence, in Sanskrit, from aṭay (causal of aṭ, "to go," ) comes the aorist ḍiṭum, and from āpay (causal of āḍ, "to obtain," ) āpipam, with which the Latin adipiscor for adāpiscecor may be compared, and the

* From chal, char; see my lesser Sanskrit Grammar, §§. 506.507.
† Pott (Etym. Forsch. II.090.) properly derives the Lett. dunduris, "hornet," from dur-ţ, "to stick"; it has, therefore, in the repeated syllable likewise an exchange of liquids: thus, also, the Greek δενδροὺς is to be derived from δένδρων, and is akin to ὀποίς and the Sanskrit dṛma, "tree," (compare Pott, II. 235.).
Greek reduplicated forms ἀτιτάλλω, δύνημι, ὀπτεύω, for ἀτατάλλω, δύνημι, ὀπτεύω (compare Pott, II. 690.). And θ ι, also, and θ τ, and the diphthongs in which ι is contained, are changed into ὰ; hence ὄνταδαμ from ὄντανυ (caus. of ὄνταν, "to make wet," compare Latin unda), ὄντιναμ from ὄν, class ten, "to abate." It was first from these formations, and the analogous forms of desideratives, that I perceived that the weight of the ι is borne less readily by the language than that of the ὰ; for otherwise it would not be replaced by ὰ in syllables, where the whole attention of the language is directed to make them as light as possible. But in the whole of Sanskrit Grammar no other case exists where ι, to lighten the syllabic weight, becomes ὰ: for while in roots beginning with a consonant desideratives in the syllable of reduplication weaken a radical α to ὰ (e.g. πιπαίσθ from παί, "to cleave"), ι remains unaltered (υυυτς, from υγυδ, "to fight,"), which serves as a proof that ι is lighter than α, because, were it heavier than α, it would have a better right to be changed into ὰ.

585. In roots which end with two consonants, of which the first is a liquid, this is rejected, in order the more to relieve the weight in the base syllable, but it is retained in the syllable of repetition; hence above (§. 584.), [G. Ed. p. 828.] ὄνταδαμ for ὄντανυνάμ; so, also, ῥίριάμ for ῥίριράμ, from ῥί, class ten, "to earn." According to this principle, in Latin also, pungo, if encumbered by reduplication, loses its nasal; thus, pupugi, not pupungi. The loss of the nasal in tetigi, tutudi, surprises us less, because in these verbs it in general belongs less strictly to the root, and is dropped also in the supine and analogous formations. But if, in Sanskrit, the first of two final consonants is a mute, and the second a sibilant, then the syllable of repetition receives only the first of the two consonants, and the base syllable retains them both; as from ἰκῆχαί (causal of ἰκῆ, "to see"), comes ἰδίχικῆχαμ, for
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Aikikṣham or Aikṣhikṣham.* This principle is followed by the Greek ἄλακκον, for which, according to the principle of the above-mentioned ἀνυδίδαμ, ἄλκακον, or, with the augment, ἄλκακον would be used.

586. In the few verbal bases which, exclusive of the causative affix ay, contain more than one syllable, the Sanskrit receives, in the syllable of repetition, only as much as can be contained in one syllable; as from avadhṝ, class ten, "to despise,"† comes ṅe-avadhṝram. The Greek follows the same principle in forms like ἄλ-ῆλφα, ἄγ-ῆγερκα, ὅρ-ὁρντα.

587. The Zend supplies us with an excellent aorist-form of the seventh formation, which has been already several times mentioned, and which was first brought to light by Burnouf, viz. मृगुषṭह ururudusha, "thou didst grow" (see §. 469.), from the root rudh, "to grow," which, in the Sanskrit सङ रुह, has preserved of the dh only the aspiration. With [G. Ed. p. 829.] respect to the length of the syllable of reduplication this form answers to those in Sanskrit like achuchaṛam (see §. 580.). The initial u of मृगुष्ठ uru-rudusha is regarded above (§. 518.) as the representative of the a of the augment, through the assimilating influence of the d of the following syllable. But it now appears to me more correct to recognise, in the initial vowel of the form spoken of, only the original accompaniment of the augment, which has been dropped, and that, therefore, from arurudhusha, by the retro-active influence of the a of the second syllable, next arose aururudhusha, as, in §. 46., I have endeavored to derive मृगुष्ठ haurva from the Sanskrit sarva, through the euphonic influence of the v; and as the base word अत्हर्वन, "priest," in the weak cases, in which the final syllable van is contracted to un, adds,

* Gutturals in the syllables of repetition are always replaced by palatals.
† I explain ava as the preposition which has grown up with the base, and regard the termination as akin to dhyāi, "to think," dhīra, "sage."
through the influence of the u of this syllable, a u to the preceding a, thus athaurun,* from which, by dislodging the a, is formed the more common athurun,† as for [G. Ed. p. 830.] the Sanskrit taruna, “young,” we find in Zend both tauruna and turuna. The u of the penultimate of urárudh-u-sha corresponds to the conjunctive vowel a of Sanskrit forms like achúchar-a-s, achúchar-a-thás, and may have proceeded from a by an assimilating influence of the u of the preceding syllable. If the older a had been retained, we should then find (according to §. 56a.), urárudhāṇa.

THE PERFECT.

588. It has been already remarked, that that Sanskrit preterite which agrees in form with the Greek perfect is, according to its signification, not a perfect, but is most frequently used in the sense of the Greek aorist (§. 513.).

* I find the initial a of the strong cases abbreviated in the examples I have before me of the weak cases. The strong cases change the proper theme átharvan to áthravan; hence the nominative áthravu (Vend. S. p. 65). Without transposition, an e, or some other auxiliary vowel, must have been inserted between the r and v, because r can neither stand at the end, nor in combination with a consonant.

† Thus Vend. S. p. 65, the genitive athurunô, and, p. 234 twice, the dative athuruné: on the other hand, p. 65, l. 18, the accusative plural athaurunáš-cha. The view I now take of the phenomenon under discussion differs from that in §. 46. in this, that I there represented the u of the second syllable of athurun as proceeding directly from the a of the original form, in consequence of an assimilation, while I now regard it as a remnant of au, and look upon the a no longer as a prefixed vowel, but as the original one, by the side of which a u has been placed through the influence of the u of the following syllable; as frequently happens with an i, through the influence of a following i or y (see §. 41.) I fully agree in this point with the opinion expressed by Burnouf in his review of the First Part of this book (Journal des Savans, 1875, in the separate impression, p. 8), where, also, the Zend aurvêt, “horse,” is in this way compared with the Sanskrit uṣāvan.
Our German unparaphrased preterite, which, in its origin, coincides with the Greek perfect and Sanskrit reduplicated preterite, has likewise renounced the perfect meaning, but in Gothic represents both the Greek imperfect and the aorist, as well as the perfect, and, in the earliest Old High German authorities, besides these tenses, the pluperfect. In the ninth, and, as Grimm remarks, perhaps so early as the eighth century, begin the circumlocutory forms of the perfect by the passive participle with the auxiliary verb haben, and, in neuter verbs, with the verb substantive, in which respect we must advert to the practice of the Sanskrit language, in expressions like gatā'smi (for gutas asmi), "ich bin geyangen," "I am having gone" (see §. 513.); as also to the circumstance, that, in the forms in तवत् tavat (tavant), the idea of possession is contained, and that uktavān asmi, "dixi," properly means, "I am gifted with having said" (therefore "having said") (see §. 513.).

[G. Ed. p. 831.] The Old High German uses, beside the verb corresponding to our haben, also eigan, which has the same import, for its paraphrase of the perfect; in the indicative, only in the plural; but, in the subjunctive, in the singular also (see Grimm, IV. 149).

589. As regards the formation of the German unparaphrased preterite, the Gothic has, in the strong conjugation, under certain circumstances, regularly preserved the reduplication, which, from the earliest period, belongs to this tense; viz. first, in all verbs (their number is, it must be allowed, but small) which have a long vowel in the root (not, perhaps, merely in consequence of a Guna in the present, and the forms thereto belonging); secondly, in those verbs which exhibit unchanged, in the present, an a long by position; as, from the roots slēp, "to sleep," vō, "to blow" (Sanskrit vā), hait, "to be called," auk, "to increase," fald, "to fold" (present fulda), the first and third person singular are saizlēp, vaivō, haihāit, aiauk,
faifalth (for faifald, see §. 93*.) The form saizlēp (regarding z for s, see §. 86. (5.)) stands so far isolated, as all other verbs, which exhibit an e in the present, replace this in the preterite by ō. They are the following: tēka, "I touch," taitōk, "I touched"; grēta, "I weep" (Sanskrit krand, "to weep"), gaigrōt, "I wept"; lēta, "I leave," lailōt "I left"; fēka, "I lament" (Latin plango), faiflōk, "I lamented"; rēda, "I advise," rairōth, "I advised." This change of the vowel cannot surprise us, as e and ō are the common representatives of the original long a (see §. 69.), as, in Greek, e and o are the usual representatives of the short a: taitōk, therefore, has the same relation to tēka, that, in Greek, τέτροφα has to τρέφω, λέκωπα to λείπω, πέποιθα to πείδω; or, more strictly, that ἔφωγα has to ἔγγυμα; for in Greek, too, η and ω are representatives of the long a. I believe that the reason of this exchange of vowels in both languages is to be found in [G. Ed. p. 832.] this, that the quality of Ơ is heavier than that of E, and that the tense under discussion, on account of its being encumbered with reduplication, feels a necessity to appear heavier in its root than the unencumbered present; as also, in Gothic, the reduplication has in general maintained itself only in roots of strong build.*

590. Vahsya, "I grow" (Zend }" ucs, "to grow"), from the root vahs, with the character of the Sanskrit fourth class (see §. 109*. 2.), and standa, "I stand," are the only verbs which, notwithstanding that they exhibit in the present an a long by position, have nevertheless permitted the reduplication to disappear. They form, in the first and third person singular preterite vōhs, stōth. The dropping of the class syllable ya of vahsya is regular, as this syllable belongs only to the special tenses (see §. 109*.).
In this respect, therefore, vōhs has the same relation to vahsya, that, in Sanskrit, nandśa has to nasyāmi, "I go to ruin"; and the ṭ of vōhs and stōth corresponds as the regular long vowel of the a (see §. 69.) to the Sanskrit ṭ of forms like nandśa. While the Old High German contrasts with its present stantu a preterite stuont (see §. 109b. 1. p. 112) stōth, which has abandoned the inorganic nasal of standa, presents, moreover, the irregularity that the th, which, according to §. 93a., has assumed the place of the ṭ, is preserved also in the terminations which are annexed; thus, first person plural, sthōthum for stōdum, as the analogy of bauth, budum, from the root bud, would lead us to expect.

591. The difficulty that, in Gothic, there are two verbs [G. Ed. p.333.] with a radical a in the present, which, in spite of their length by position, have nevertheless lost the reduplication of the preterite, is again, in a certain degree, obviated by the existence of two preterites, which have preserved the reduplication without their vowels being long naturally or by position; viz. kaihah, "I hanged," faifah, "I seized" (present haha, faha). But if it is considered that these verbs, in the other German dialects, have really length by position, and probably originally had it in Gothic also, the violation of the proposition expressed above, that the reduplication is borne in Gothic only by roots with long syllables, appears, through this consideration, less important.*

* In Old High German the preterite is hiang, fiang (hianc, fiane), which would lead us to expect a present hangu, fanu, for which, however, occur háhu, fāhu, infinitive háhan, fāhan. Graff gives only to the former a long a, to the latter a short one; but the quoted examples confirm also the length of the former, not by circumflex or doubling of the a. It is highly probable, however, that the same quantity belongs to both verbs: thus they are either háhan and fuhān, or háhu and fāhan. As they have no preterite, if the length of the a is not proved, it cannot be decided from the point
592. J. Grimm first acutely remarked, that the other German dialects, in those classes of verbs which in Gothic clearly exhibit the reduplication, continue it in like manner, although scarcely perceptibly. The syllables of reduplication lose the appearance of a syllable of reduplication, when the following syllable is either quite passed over, or only loses its consonant, and unites its vowel with that of the syllable of reduplication. The former is the case in some Sanskrit desiderative forms, as lips, pits (Lesser Sanskrit Grammar, §. 490.), for which, according to rule, we should have lilaps, pipats;* wherefore it appears to me far more proper to assume the suppression of the second syllable, than that of reduplication, together with the change of a into i, for which no reason at all could exist, because the form would have been already sufficiently weakened by the suppression of the syllable of reduplication. A simple consonant is suppressed in the Greek γίςαμα from γί-γόςαμι, which is, however, itself an abbreviation of γιγέςαμοι: moreover, in the Sanskrit aorist, anśam (=anaisam) from ananiśam, and, in the Latin perfects analogous with it, as cépi (see §. 548.): finally, in the Old High German preterites, as hialt (our hielt) from hihalt, for which, in Gothic, haihald.

593. It must, perhaps, be regarded as a dialectic peculiarity in Gothic, that the syllable of reduplication has always ai. It was the custom, perhaps, at the time when all Germ-
man languages were still one, that the heaviest vowel, a, was weakened in the syllable of repetition to the lightest, i, as is the case in Sanskrit in the syllable of repetition of desideratives, where, e.g., from dah, "to burn," comes di-
dhakṣh, not dadhakṣh; and as in Latin reduplicated forms like cecini, the a in the syllable of repetition becomes e, and in the base i, while a radical o and u in both places remain unchanged (momordi, tutudi). For the diphthong ai, e.g., of HAIT, "to be called," i would be, in the syllable of rep-

[G. Ed. p. 835.] tition, quite as much in its place; for, in Sanskrit, only the last element of the diphthong रे ( = a + i), and of diphthongs generally enters the syllable of reduplica-
tion; wherefore, e.g., the reduplicated preterite of kेट ( = kait), "to invite," is chikेल (first and third person singular). If an infringement of the law for the mutation of sounds, by pre-
serving the old tenuis in the final sound (as in slेपa = स्लेपिन swapimिः, "I sleep"), be assumed, it might be said that the Gothic HAIT would correspond to this Sanskrit kेट, and therefore haihait (for hihait) to the above-mentioned चिकेल chikेल. But though au also is, in Gothic syllables of redup-
lication, represented by ai, as ai-auk, "I increased," while, in Sanskrit, ô ( = a + u) becomes u, as, puprोlha, from prोl, "to satisfy;" still the i of this ai may be regarded as a weakening of u, as we have seen above, in Sanskrit, the reduplicated aorist अउंढिदमं for अउंढुदाम proceed from उंढ und (§. 584.). We might also regard the i of ai-auk as a weakening of the a of the base-syllable, which, how-
ever, appears to me less probable, as in diphthongs the second element always has the etymological preponde-
rence, and the first is a mere phonetic prefix; on which account I prefer recognising in the syllable of repetition of the Latin ceclidi, of ceclio ( = caido), the second element of the diphthong ce, rather than the first, although a in the Latin syllables of repetition is regularly replaced by e. Be this, however, as it may, I consider this as certain,
that the ai in Gothic syllables of reduplication was formerly a simple i, and that this ai is a dialectic peculiarity limited to the Gothic, like that which, according to §. 82., the Gothic employs instead of a simple i before h and r; which latter, in the other dialects also, is alone represented. We miss, therefore, in the Old High German hi-alt for Gothic haihald (from hihalt), only the h of the second syllable; and in the Old Northern iðk, “I” or “he increased,” nothing is wanting of the Gothic [G. Ed. p. 836.]

ai-auk, as far as the latter is an inorganic extension of i-auk; but au has, according to the Sanskrit principle, been contracted to ð, while in the participle passive aukinn it has remained open, and in the present, by a doubled Umlaut,* become ey.

594. The Old Northern reduplicated preterites of verbs with a radical a (Grimm’s first conjugation) appear to me to stand upon a different footing from the Gothic like haihald, in so far as the latter have weakened the a in the syllable of repetition to i, and have prefixed to it an a, while the former (the Old Northern), quite in accordance with the Sanskrit principle, have left the a of the syllable of reduplication unaltered and without addition, but, on the other hand (like the Latin perfects tetigi, cecini), have weakened the a of the base to i, and, in agreement with the Sanskrit law of sound, have contracted the latter with the a of the syllable of repetition to ð. In this way only, in my opinion, can we explain it, that as, in Old Northern, from the root HALD, “to hold,” (whence the present is, by the Umlaut, held, and the participle passive haldinn), comes the preterite helt (the tenuis for the medial at the end of the word, as in Middle High German, see §. 93*), plural heldum; therefore helt from hahilt for hahalt, as the reverse case of the Old High German hi-alt from hihalt for hahalt. So also in roots with a long ð, for

* By the Umlaut the a becomes ð = e, and the u, ð = i = y — Translator.
The Gothic uses e (§ 69.); e.g. from GRAT, "to weep," and BLAS, "to blow," come grêt, blês, as the contraction of gra(gr)t, blu(bl)is,* in contradistinction to the Old High German blias (blies) from bliblas. The Old Saxon stands on the same ground as the Old Northern; hence, from fallu,

[G. Ed. p. 837.] "I fall," fêll, "I fell," from fofêll; and from slapu. "I sleep," slêp, "I slept," from slâslip; just as, in Sanskrit, plurals like nêmima, from nanîmima, correspond to singulars like nanâma, "I bent myself," of which more hereafter.

595. Verbs which, in Gothic, have the diphthong ai as the radical vowel, lay aside, in Old High German, in the base-syllable, the last element of the said diphthong, and retain only the first, either unaltered, or corrupted to e, which, indeed, happens in most of the received authorities; hence, to the Gothic preterite haihait, "I was called," in Otfrid hiaz (for hîhaiz from hîhaiz), in the other authorities quoted by Graff, hiez, corresponds; which latter, in respect to its e, answers better to the present heizu (= Gothic haita), where, however, the ie is not yet to be regarded as one sound (= i), as in our New German hiess. Of the Gothic diphthong au, we find, according as authorities vary, either the first or the second element preserved, and the former, indeed, either unaltered or changed to e, and also the latter either unchanged or corrupted to o (see § 77.); e.g. from klaupa comes, in Gothic, the preterite haihlaup (see § 598.), for which, in Old High German, we find in Graff the forms liaf (from lilaf for hlihlauf), lief, liuf, liof.

596. In Sanskrit the syllable of reduplication always has the radical vowel, only shortened, if long; and, as has been already remarked, of diphthongs only the last ele-

* Present, with the Umlaut, grat, blas, participle passive grâtian, blâsinn. With respect to the rejection of a double consonant in the reduplicated preterite, compare the relation of the Old High German vior, "four," for Gothic fidvôr
FORMATION OF TENSES.

ment (see §. 593); hence, *babandh, from bandh, "to bind"; babhás, from bhás, "to shine"; bibhid, from bhid, "to cleave"; didip, from dīp, "to shine"; tutud, from tud, "to beat, push"; pupdr, from pūr, "to fill." If for the vowel ri the syllable of reduplication receives an a, this proceeds from the primitive form ar; e. g. mamarda, [G. Ed. p. 838.]

"I and he crushed,"† comes not from mrid, but from mard, which in the dual and plural is contracted to mrid; hence first person plural mamridima. Roots which begin with vowels we have already discussed (see §. 534.); only this may be here further mentioned, that roots which begin with a and end with two consonants proceed in a very peculiar and remarkable way, since they first contract the vowel of repetition with that of the root to a long a, then add an euphonic n, and then annex the whole root a second time, so that thus the radical vowel occurs three times; as, d-n-anj, from aa-n-anj, from anj, "to anoint" (Latin ungo).

597. The Greek pays no regard, in its syllables of reduplication in roots beginning with a vowel, to the vowel of the base, but always replaces it by e, which the Latin does in its perfects (which are reduplicated and carried back to the Sanskrit seventh aorist formation), only in the case, in which the root exhibits the heaviest of all vowels, viz. a, which appears too heavy for the syllable of reduplication, as, in Sanskrit, it is found inadmissible in the syllables of reduplication of desideratives, and is replaced by the lightest vowel, i. Thus in Greek the perfect téraφα corresponds to the Sanskrit tatapa or tatāpa, "I burned," just as téνφα to the Sanskrit tutōpa (pl. tutupima = téνφαμεν) "I beat,

* I give the theme without any personal termination whatever.

† Compare the Latin momordi, although this is based on the aorist of the seventh formation, where amamardam, middle amamardē, might have been expected.
wounded, slew," \( \pi \epsilon \phi \lambda \eta \kappa \alpha \) to the Sanskrit pipraya or pi-
pr\( \acute{\lambda} \)ya, from pr\( \acute{\iota} \), "to rejoice, to love" (compare the Gothic
[G. Ed. p. 839.] fri\( \acute{\iota} \), "I love"). It is certain, that origi-
nally the Greek, also, must, in the syllable of reduplication,
have.had regard to the radical vowel; that, however, in the
course of time, all vowels in this place were weakened to \( e \),
as is the case in New German in the final syllables of poly-
syllabic words; as, e.g., we contrast binda, salb\( \ddot{o} \), gabum, with
the Gothic binda, salb\( \ddot{o} \), gabum, and G"uste, G"usten, with the
Gothic gasteis, gastim. A similar weakness or vitiation to
that which has overtaken our final syllables might easily
have befallen a Greek initial syllable not belonging to the
base itself.

598. As regards the laws to which the consonants in
the syllables of reduplication are subjected, the Sanskrit
replaces the gutturals by corresponding palatals, and, in
agreement with the Greek, the aspirated consonants by
corresponding non-aspirates; e.g. chak\( \ddot{s} \), from k\( \ddot{a} \), "to
give light";† jagam, from gam," to go"; dad\( \ddot{h} \), from dh\( \ddot{a} \),
"to set, lay"; as, in Greek, \( \pi \epsilon \theta \eta \), from the corresponding
root \( \Theta \)H. Of two consonants combined in the initial sound
in Sanskrit, the first is usually repeated; hence chakrand,
from krand, "to weep"; chikship, from kship, "to cast."
The Gothic follows the same principle, if the second of
the combined consonants is a liquid; hence gaigr\( \dot{\o} \), "I wept,"
corresponds to the Sanskrit word of the same import, cha-
kr\( \ddot{u} \)nda; and saiz\( \ddot{e} \)p (see §. 86.(5.)), "I slept," to the San-
skrit sush\( \ddot{u} \)opa.‡ We might hence infer that the preterite

* Regarding the origin of the \( k \) and the aspirate of r\( \epsilon \nu \phi \alpha \), see §.568. &c.
† I refer the Gothic haiza, "torch" (\( z \) a softened \( s \), see §.86.(5.)) to
this root.
‡ The root swap is irregular in this, that it is contracted before the
heavy terminations into s\( \ddot{u} \)p (sh\( \ddot{u} \)p); and on this form is founded the syll-
able of reduplication, through the u of which the s following becomes sh.
which nowhere occurs, of *hlaupa* is *haihlaup*, not *htaihlaup*. But if, in Gothic, the second of the combined consonants is a mute, this finds its way into the syllable [G. Ed. p. 840.] of reduplication also; hence *skaiskaith*, "I separated," the third person plural of which, *skaiskaidun*, occurs in Luke ix. 33: hence might be deduced, also, *staitaut*, from *STAUT*. The other German dialects have, unrestrictedly, left two combined consonants together in the syllable of repetition; hence, in Old High German, *sliaf*, "I slept," *spialt*, "I cleft," from *slislaf*, *spispalt*; unless in the second syllable one of the two consonants would be rejected, as in the Latin *spopondi*, *steti*, for *spospondi*, *stesti*. But the Gothic *skaiskaith* speaks against the latter.

599. It remains to be remarked, with respect to the Sanskrit syllables of reduplication, that if a root begins with a sibilant before a mute, the syllable of repetition, according to the general law, does not contain the first consonant but the second, respect being had to the rules of sound before mentioned; e.g. from *sthā* comes *tasthāu*, "I, he stood;" from *spriś* (*sparś*); *pasparśa*, "I or he touched," in opposition to the Latin *steti*, *spopondi*. The Zend, closely as it is allied to the Sanskrit, does not recognise this rule. I cannot, indeed, quote the perfect of *wṛṇu stā*, nor any other perfect of roots with an initial sibilant before a mute, but as *sthā* in Sanskrit has a syllable of reduplication in the special tenses also, and forms, in the present, *tīṣṭhāmi*, we see, from the Zend *wṛṇu histāmi*, that the law of reduplication under discussion, at the time of the identity of the Zend with the Sanskrit, was not yet in force, or at least not in its full extent. Of the Latin it deserves further to be remarked, that in its *sisto*, which is properly the counterpart of the Sanskrit *tīṣṭhāmi*, Gr. *ἰστημι*, and Zend *histāmi* (see §. 508.), it follows the general law for syllables of reduplication, while analogously with *steti* a present *stito* might have been expected.
600. With respect to the Greek, as soon as we recognise in the i of ἵστημι, as in the Zend hi of histāmi, a syllable of reduplication, to which we are compelled, by its analogy with διδωμι, τίθημι, βίβημι, &c., and by the circumstance that σ in the initial sound is easily weakened to the rough breathing, we must allow, that in the perfect ἐστηκα, also, the rough breathing stands for σ, and that, therefore, we have in this form a more perfect syllable of reduplication than is usually the case in roots which have in the initial sound a heavier consonant combination than that of a mute before a liquid. We cannot place ἐστηκα on the same footing with εἰμάρται, which we would suffer to rest on itself; for the latter has just as much right to the rough breathing as the Latin sisto to its s: and when Buttman says (Gr. § 83. Rem. 6.), "The often-occurring ἀφέσταλκα (presupposing ἐσταλκα) in the Milesian inscription given by Chisbull, p. 67, furnishes a proof that the rough breathing instead of the reduplication of the perfect went further in the old dialects than the two cases to be met with in the current language (ἐστηκα, εἰμάρται)," it is important to observe, that here, also, the root begins with σ, which has been preserved in the syllable of repetition as the rough breathing. In ἐστηκα this phenomenon has been preserved in the language as commonly used, because, in my opinion, the analogy of the present and imperfect has protected the breathing which belongs to the reduplication of the perfect.

601. Moreover, if, in other consonantal combinations than that of a mute before a liquid, the syllable of repetition has usually dropped the consonant to be repeated, this clearly happened because a greater weight of sound in the base syllable rendered a lightening of the syllable of repetition desirable; hence, e.g. ἔψαλκα, ἐφθορα, from πέψαλκα, πέφθορα. In these and similar forms the coincidence of the initial syllable with the augment is only casual; and if in the e a remnant of a syllable of reduplication is recognised, we are
not thereby compelled to explain the ε of ἐψαλλων, ἐφθειρον also, as the syllable of reduplication, since in the imperfect and aorist (and this appears from the Sanskrit) a simple vowel, independent of the root, has just as much a primitive foundation, as in the perfect, in roots beginning with a consonant, a syllable beginning with the radical consonant or its representative has. It cannot, however, be denied, that in some cases, through an error in the use of language, the example of the augmented preterites has operated on the perfect. It may be, that the ε of ἐαγα, ἐοῦρηκα, is just as much the augment as that of ἐαεα, ἐεοῦρονν: but it also admits of being regarded in the perfect as the reduplication, since ε and ο are originally identical with α, and have proceeded from it by corruption (see §. 3.); and since both α and ο easily become ε as, e.g., the final ε of ἐδεικέ (= चक्षुष adikṣhat, see p. 803, G. ed.) is, according to its origin, identical with the α of ἐδεικσα, ἐδεικσ-ς, &c., and the ε of vocatives, like λύκε (= लुक urika), is only a weakening of the ο concluding the base-word, and corrupted from the older α (see §. 204.).

602. To pass over, then, to the alterations, to which the radical vowel in the Sanskrit reduplicated preterite is subjected, we will consider first the roots with α. This is lengthened before a simple consonant in the third person singular active, and at pleasure, also, in the first; hence, from char, “to go,” to which the Gothic root FAR, “to wander,” corresponds, come chachdra or chachara, “I went,” chachara, “he went. This analogy is [G. Ed. p. 843.] followed by those Gothic verbs which have preserved a radical a before simple consonants in the present, but replace it in the preterite with δ; as fara, the preterite of which, fœr, in respect to its vowel, corresponds as exactly as possible to the Sanskrit chahr of chachara, for δ is, in Gothic,

* The digamma belonging to this verb, which rests on the Sanskrit bh of bhanj, “to break,” leads us to expect an aorist, ἐφαξα, and in the most ancient time a perfect ἐφαγα for the Sanskrit babhanja.
the regular representative of the long \( \dot{a} \), and takes the place of the short \( a \), where the latter is to be lengthened, as, *vice versa*, \( \dot{a} \), in case of abbreviation, becomes \( a \); on which account feminine bases in \( \dot{a} \) (=Sanskrit \( \dot{a} \)) exhibit in the uninflected nominative an \( a \), since long vowels at the end of a word are the easiest subjected to abbreviation (see §.137.). The relation, therefore, of *for* to *fara* is based originally not on an alteration of quality, but only on that of quantity; and the vowel difference has here just as little influence in the designation of the relation of time, as, in the noun, on that of the case-relation. As, however, in *for* the true expression of past time, viz. the reduplication, has disappeared, and *for* stands for *faifor*, the function performed by the difference of the vowel of the root, in common with that of the personal terminations (or of the absence of terminations, as in *for* as first and third person singular), is, for the practical use of language, the designation of time. Thus, in our German subjunctive preterite in the plural, the *Umlaut* is the only sign by which we recognise the relation of mood, and which, therefore, is to be held as the exponent of the modal relation, since the true expression of the same, viz. the vowel \( e \) (e.g. of *wären*, *wärel*), which was formerly an \( i \) (Old High German *wärimes*, *wärıl*), and, as such, has produced the *Umlaut* by its assimilative power, is no longer, in its corrupted form, distinguishable from the termination of the indicative.

[G. Ed. p.844.] 603. The Gothic *for* is distinguished from the Sanskrit *chår* of *chachāra* by this, that it retains its long vowel through all persons and numbers, while in Sanskrit it is necessary only in the third person singular, and is found or not, at will, in the first person singular. To the Gothic, however, the Greek second perfect corresponds in the case where a radical \( \ddot{a} \) is lengthened to \( \dot{a} \), or its representative, \( \eta \). The relation of *kράζω* (ἐκράγον) to *κέκραγα*, of *θάλλω* (θάλω) to *τέθηλα*, corresponds exactly to the relation of the Sanskrit *chār̥mi* and Gothic *fara* to *chachāra*, *för*. In Greek verbs which have changed a radical \( a \), in the present, to \( e \), the change of
this e into the heavier o is substitute for the lengthening
(see §. 589.).

604. In roots which end with two consonants the lengthen-
ing of the a to ð is, in Sanskrit, quite omitted, and so, in
Gothic, that of a to ð; as, in Sanskrit, mamantha, "I or he
shook," mamanthima, "we shook," from manth; so, in Go-
thetic, vaivald, "I or he ruled," vaivaldum, "we ruled," from
vald. Those Gothic verbs which weaken, in the present, a
radical a before a double consonant to i (see p. 116 G. ed.),
replace the same in the plural numbers of the preterite, and
in the whole subjunctive preterite, by u; hence, BAND, "to
bind" (from which the present binda), forms in the singular
of the preterite band, bans-t (see §. 102.), band, answering to
the Sanskrit babandha, babandh-i-tha, babandha: in the
second person dual, however, bund-u-ts for Sanskrit baband-a-
thus; and in the plural, bund-u-m, bund-u-t, bund-u-n, for
Sanskrit babandh-i-ma, babandh-a-(tha), babandh-us. The
subjunctive is bundyau, &c. The Old High German, which
has for its termination in the second person singular in-
stead of the Gothic t an i, which, in my opinion, corresponds to
the Sanskrit conjunctive vowel i, exhibits, before this i, also
the alteration of the a to u; hence, in the first and third per-
son singular bant corresponding to the Sanskrit babandha and
Gothic band; but in the second person [G. Ed. p. 845.]
bunt-i, answering to the Sanskrit babandh-i-tha and Gothic
bans-t. Hence we perceive that the change of the a into u
depends on the extent of the word, since only the monosyllabic
forms have preserved the original a. We perceive further,
that the weight of the u appears to the German idioms lighter
than that of the a, otherwise the u would not relieve the a
in the same way as we saw above ai and uu replaced by i
in the polysyllabic forms, or before heavy terminations (see
p. 707 G. ed.); and as, in Latin, the a of calco and salsus,
under the encumbrance of a preceding preposition, is repre-
sented by u (conculco, insulsus).
605. Where, in Gothic, a radical a is weakened before simple consonants, in the present, to i, but retained in the singular of the preterite, we find instead of it, in both the plural numbers and in the whole subjunctive preterite, in all the polysyllabic past forms, therefore, an ē, and for that in the Old and Middle High German an ā, which here, however, occurs as soon as in the second person singular indicative, because it is polysyllabic: in Middle High German, however, it is changed to æ. The present of the root LAS, "to read," is, in Gothic, lisa, in Old High German lisu, in Middle High German lise; the preterite in Gothic is las, las-t, las, lēsum, lēsut, lēsun; subjunctive lēsyau, &c.: in Old High German las, lāsi, las, lāsumēs, lāsut, lāsun; subjunctive lāsi, &c.: in Middle High German las, lāse, las, lāsen, lāset, lāsen; subjunctive lāse. This phenomenon stands in contradiction to all other strong verbs, because here the polysyllabic forms have a heavier vowel than the monosyllabic; but the reverse naturally appears everywhere else. Even in the Sanskrit we find this apparent contradiction to the law of gravity, and the surprising, although, perhaps, accidental, coincidence with the Gothic, that in both languages in similar places—

[G. Ed. p. 846.] viz. before the heavy terminations of the dual and plural—a radical a is changed into ē, in both languages only in roots which terminate in a simple consonant; to which is further added, in Sanskrit, the limitation, that the initial consonant, also, must as a rule be simple, and cannot be v or the like, which, in the syllable of repetition, according to §. 598, experiences a change. The syllable of repetition, however, is suppressed in the cases in which the a is changed into ē. This is the practical view of the rule, which we shall subsequently endeavour to elucidate theoretically. Let the root tan, "to extend," serve as example.
FORMATION OF TENSES.

ACTIVE.

SINGULAR.

tatâna or tatana, téniva for tataniva, ténima for tatanima.
tatantha, or ténitha for tatanitha, ténathus for tatanathus, têna for tata.
tâna, ténatus for tatanatus, têns for tatanus.

PLURAL.

MIDDLE.

têné for tanâ, têniahe for tataniahe, tênimahâ for tatanimahâ.
têniûhe for tanîûhe, tênidhwe for tatanidhwe

têné for tanâ, têndé for tanâtê, tênîre for tanârê.

It appears, therefore, from this paradigm, that the form têna used for tatan, though far the most common, is adopted only before heavy terminations, or in such persons as, in their full form, would appear to consist of four syllables; for although, in the second person plural, têna stands for tatana, and in the third person plural, têns for tatanus, still us in this place is an abbreviation of anti (compare §. 462.), and a is clearly only the remnant of an original termination atha: the a of têna, for tên-a-tha, corresponds [G. Ed. p. 847.] merely to the conjunctive vowel of the Greek τερόφ-α-τε and of the Gothic vaivald-u-th, fôr-u-th, lês-u-th.* The reason of

* I have already, in my System of Conjugation, and in the Annals of Oriental Literature (London, 1820), called attention to the fact, that the Sanskrit tutupa in the second person plural is an abbreviated form, and in the former parts of this book the fact has often been alluded to, that the Sanskrit, in particular cases, appears in disadvantageous contrast with its European sister idioms. It has therefore surprised me that Professor Höser, in his Treatise "Contributions," &c., p. 40, has made so general an assertion, that recent investigators have not been desirous "of keeping perfectly free from the unfortunate error of believing in the imaginary inviolability and pristine fidelity and perfection of the Sanskrit." For my part I have never conceded to the Sanskrit such pristine fidelity; and it has always given me pleasure to notice the cases in which the European sister languages surpass it, as the Lithuanian does at this day, in everywhere
the abbreviation is clearly apparent in the second person singular; for if here the termination tha is joined directly to the root, the full reduplication remains; but if the number of syllables is increased by a conjunctive vowel, then tēn is used for tatan; thus tēnitha (from tatanitha) answering to tatantha. I recognise, as has been already observed (see §. 548.), in forms like tēn a concealed reduplication; thus tēn from tatin (as in Latin cecini for cacani), and this from tatan, whence, by rejecting the second t, tān (for ta-an) may have been formed, and so, in earlier times, have been used for tēn; and I think that the Gothic ē, in forms like lēsum, is not found there because the Sanskrit, in analogous forms, has an ē, but for this reason, that the Sanskrit ē was formerly an ā, but the Gothic ē represents the ā (§. 69.). The Old High German has preserved the original sound, and exhibits lāsumēs (from lalasumēs), which, in contrast with the Gothic lēsumēs, appears like a Doric form.

[G. Ed. p. 848.] contrasted with an Ionic one.* While, in the second person singular, the Gothic lās-t, on account of its monosyllabic nature, is based on Sanskrit forms like tatantha, the Old High German lāsi answers to the contracted form tēnitha. It must be assumed that the Gothic lās, last, was formerly lailas, lailast; and then, too, the plural lēsum stood in the proper relation to lailas (lalas), i.e. in the relation of the weaker to the stronger radical form. We give, for a complete general view of the analogies existing between the Sanskrit and the German in the case before us, the

expressing the idea "who?" by kus, while the Sanskrit kus, according to fixed laws of sound, becomes at one time kāh, at another kāḥ, at another ka, and appears in its original form only before t and th.

* Regarding the Latin forms like cépi, see §. 548. It may be here further remarked, that Ag. Benary, also (Doctrine of Latin Sounds, p. 276, &c.), traces back the Latin perfect in all its formations to the Sanskrit aorist.
reduplicated preterite of सदे sad, “to sit,” “to place oneself,” corresponding to the Gothic sat and Old High German saz, “I sate,” connected with it in form and sense.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sanskrit</th>
<th>Gothic</th>
<th>Old High German</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sasād-ā or sasad-ā,</td>
<td>(sai)sat,</td>
<td>(si)saz.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sasat-tha or sēd-i-tha,</td>
<td>(sai)sas-t,</td>
<td>sāz-i-’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sasād-ā,</td>
<td>(sai)sat,</td>
<td>(si)saz.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Singular.**

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sēd-i-vā,</td>
<td>sētū? (see §. 441.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sēd-a-thus,</td>
<td>sēt-u-ts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sēd-a-tus,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Dual.**

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sēd-i-ma,</td>
<td>sēt-u-m,</td>
<td>sāz-u-mēs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sēd-a-’,</td>
<td>sēt-u-th,</td>
<td>sāz-u-t.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sēd-us,</td>
<td>sēt-u-n,</td>
<td>sāz-u-n.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Plural.**

“Remark 1.—That in the example here [G. Ed. p. 849.] given, as generally in Grimm’s tenth, eleventh, and twelfth conjugations, the a of the preterite is the real radical vowel—that in the present it is weakened to i, and that the i of the present has not, vice versa, been strengthened in the preterite to a—I infer, not only because the Sanskrit, where it admits of comparison, everywhere exhibits a as the unmistakeable radical vowel, but especially from the circumstance that the Gothic causal verb, where any such corresponds to the primitive verb, everywhere uses the a in the present even, while the primitive verb has it merely in the preterite; for instance, from SAT, “to sit,” comes the causal sātya, “I set” = Sanskrit sādayāmi. If it were merely the object of the language to gain in the causal a vowel connected with the primitive verb, but strengthened, then if
SIT were the root, from it would perhaps have proceeded seitya (=sītya) or saitya; and in reality the verbs, to which I ascribe vetica as the radical vowel, exhibit, in the causal, at, as those with a radical u employ the diphthong au; in exact agreement with the Sanskrit, where i and u receive Guna in the causal i.e. prefix a. Thus in Gothic, from ur-RIS, 'to stand up,' (ur-reisa, ur-rais, ur-risum) comes ur-raisya, 'I raise up'; from DRUS, 'to fall' (driusa, draus, drusum), ga-drausya, 'I plunge'; as, in Sanskrit, from vid and budh, 'to know' vēdayāmi (=vaidayāmi), bōdhayāmi (=baudhayāmi), 'I make to know.' The circumstance, that Sanskrit verbs with a radical a correspond to the Gothic sat, 'I sate,' band, 'I bound,' would not alone furnish any sufficient ground for assuming that the said and analogous Gothic verbs exhibit the root in the singular of the preterite; for it might certainly be allowed that binda proceeds from the Sanskrit bandha, sita from sad, and that an original a has here been corrupted to i; but it might still be maintained that the a of the preterite band, sat, is not a transmission from the period of identity with the Sanskrit, but that it has been newly developed from the i of the present, because the change of sound of i to a is the symbol of past time. I object to this view, however, first, because not only does sat answer to sasada or sasāda, but also the plural sētam from sātum, Old High German sāxumes, to sēdima from sādima (sa(s)adima), and it is impossible to consider this double and surprising coincidence as fortuitous; secondly, because, as has been above remarked, the causals too recognise the a of the verbs under discussion as a radical vowel; thirdly, because substantives also, like the German Band, Satz, which have nothing to do with the expression of past time, or any other temporal relation, conform [G. Ed. p. 850.] to the vowel of the preterite; fourthly, because generally, in the whole Indo-European family of languages, no case occurs of grammatical relations being
expressed by the change of the radical vowel; fifthly, because the reduplication, which is the real expression of the past, is still clearly retained in Gothic, in the verbs mentioned above, and is therefore adequate ground for assuming that sat is an abbreviation of saisat, but that sætum for sætum is a contraction of sa(s)a-tum.”

“Remark 2.—The Sanskrit roots which begin with a consonant which must be replaced by another cognate one, refrain from the contraction described above; for if the g of the base syllable of jagam dropped out, and the two a were melted down to e, then jėm would assume an appearance too much estranged from the root; and this is certainly the reason why the contraction is avoided. It is omitted, also, in roots which begin with two consonants, and, indeed, for the same reason; for if, e.g., the st of the second syllable of tastan was dropped, the contracted form would be tēn, in which the root stan would no longer be recognised. There are, however, a few exceptions from the restriction specified; as, babhaj from bhaj, ‘to pay homage,’ is always contracted to भज bhaj; as far as is yet known, though भेज bēj might be expected; but the aspiration of the base-consonant, which has been dropped, has been carried back to the syllable of repetition, according to the principle of the above-mentioned धिष्ठ dhikṣṭ for didhakṣṭ, from dah, ‘to burn’ (see §. 593.). It is more difficult to account for the fact of some roots, which begin with two consonants having permitted themselves to be contracted, and having retained both consonants in the syllable of repetition, since, e.g., to the reduplicated perfect-theme tatras a contracted form trēs corresponds, while from tatras, by rejecting the tr of the second syllable, should come tēs. Either, then, in trēs the r, which is suppressed in the full reduplicated form (tatras for tratras), is again restored, in order to comply with the requirement that the form of the root be not too much disfigured, or
the forms like trés proceed from a period when the syllable of repetition still combined the two consonants, as in the Latin spopondi, steti, and in the Gothic skaiskaith; or, lastly, and this is most probable, forms like trés proceed from a period when the language had completely forgotten the ground of their origin in contraction, and when in forms

[G. Ed. p. 851.] like sédima reduplication was no longer perceived, but only the change of a radical a into ē, and it was believed that the true exponent of the relation of time was therein recognised. Thus, in a measure, the Gothic frehunum, 'we asked' (Sanskrit paprichchhima, not prēchhima, from prachh, 'to ask'), was prepared by Sanskrit forms like trésima, 'we trembled,' bhremima, 'we wandered,' and some similar ones. The Sanskrit and German in this agree most admirably, that roots which end with two consonants have not permitted the contraction to make its way; certainly because, through their stronger structure, they had more power to bear the full reduplication (compare § 589.), which has at last disappeared in Gothic in those verbs with a radical a, which weaken that vowel, in the present, to i, so that band, bundum, correspond to the Sanskrit babandha, babandhima. To a Gothic present banda a preterite baiband would correspond.”

606. It is not requisite to assume that forms like सेद्यम् sédima, “we sate,” which has been compared above (p. 825) to the Gothic sētum and Old High German sāzum, existed so early as the period of the unity of language. I rather hold the Sanskrit sédima and Gothic sētum, besides being identical in their root, to be connected only in this point, that they both, independently of each other, have, in consequence of a contraction, lost the semblance of a reduplicated form; that in both the ē stands for an older à, which is preserved in the Old High German sāzumēs; that the Sanskrit sēd for sēd has sprung from sasād, as the Gothic sēt for sēt from sasat, the latter natu-
rally at a time, when the syllable of repetition was still faithful to the radical syllable as regards the vowel. The contraction of polysyllabic forms into monosyllabic, by rejecting the consonant of the second syllable, or the consonant together with its vowel (as above in lips for lilaps, §. 592.), is so natural, that different languages may easily chance to coincide in this point; but such an omission might most easily occur in reduplicated forms, because [G. Ed. p. 852.] the expression of the same syllable twice running might be fatiguing, and therefore there would be a direct occasion for the suppression of the second syllable or its consonant. In verbs with a radical a the occasion is the more urgent, because a is the heaviest vowel, and hence there is the more reason to seek for a diminution in weight. Latin forms like cecini, tetigi (compared with such as tutudi, momordi), comply with the requirement to be weakened by reducing the a to i in the base-syllable, and to e in the syllable of repetition, while perfects (aorists) like cēpi, fēci, in their process of diminishing the weight, coincide with the Sanskrit sēdīma and Gothic sētum, which does not prevent the assumption that each of the three languages has arrived at the contracted form in its own way, as the Persian em and English am (=em), “I am,” approach so closely, because they both, but quite independently of each other, have abbreviated the primitive form asmi in the same way, while in the third person the Persian and Latin est coincide, through a similar corruption of the old form asti; or as the Old High German fior, vior, stand in the same relation to the Gothic fidvōr that the Latin quar of quar-tus does to the to-be-presupposed quatuor-tus. In conclusion, I shall further observe that the Gothic man, “I mean,” though, according to form, a preterite, and based on the Sanskrit mamana or mamāna,* still

* The root man, “to think,” is indeed, in the present condition of the language, used only in the middle (thus mēnē, “I, he thought”), which, however,
in the plural forms not mēnum, after the analogy of mēnima, but munum, which leads us to conjecture an older maimunum for mamunum, as bundum for baibundum, babundum. Simi-
larly, skulum, "we should," not skelum (singular skal). From mag, "I can," comes magum, without weakening the a to u. In respect to this and similar verbs it may, however, be observed, that in the Sanskrit vēdu, "I know," and Greek οἶδα (=Gothic vait, see p. 711 G. ed.), the redupli-
cation is lost, and perhaps, also, all German verbs, which associate the sense of the present with the terminations of the preterite, have never had reduplication, on which account there would be no reason to expect a mēnum for mānum from mamunum.

607. Verbs with a radical i or u before a simple final conso-
nant have Guna, in Sanskrit, before the light terminations of the reduplicated preterite, and, therefore, only in the singular of the active. This Guna is the insertion of an a before the radical vowel, just as in Gothic (Grimm's eighth and ninth con-
jugations). As, however, with the exception of the few verbs which belong to the Sanskrit fourth class (see §. 109*. 2.), all strong verbs belong only to the Sanskrit first class, which, in the special tenses, has Guna pervading it; so also, in the Ger-
man verbs with a radical i and u, Guna must be looked for in the present and the moods dependent thereon. The Guna vowel a has, however, in the present, been weakened to i, and is only retained as a in the monosyllabic preterite singular. While, therefore, the Sanskrit root budh, cl. 1, "to know," forms, in the present, bōdhāmi, pl. bōdhāmas (=baudhāmi, baudhā-
mas), and, in the reduplicated preterite, bubōdha (=bubaudha), plural bubudhima, the corresponding Gothic root BUD ("to offer," "to order," ) forms, in the present, biuda,* plural

however, does not prevent the assumption that originally an active also has existed.

* Graff, who has in general supported with his assent my theory of the German Ablaut (change of sound), which I first submitted in my Review of Grimm's
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biudam, and in the preterite bauth (see §. 93*.), plural budum. In verbs with a radical i the Guna vowel [G. Ed. p. 854.] i is melted down in German with the radical vowel to a long i, which, in Gothic, is written ei:* hence the Gothic root BIT, “to bite,” forms, in the present, beita (=bīta, Old High German bīzu), and in the singular of the preterite bait, plural bitum, answering to the Sanskrit bibhēda (from bibhāida), “I and he cleft,” bibhidima, “we cleft.” In the present बिहिद, if it belonged to the first class, would form bhēḍāmi, to which the Gothic beita (from bīta) has the same relation as above biuda to bōdhāmi. The relation of the Gothic beita from bīta to the Sanskrit bhēḍāmi from bhaidāmi, is like that of the plural nominative fadei-s (from the base FADI) to the Sanskrit patay-as from pati, “lord,” only that in patay-as the ē, =a+i, is resolved into ay on account of the following vowel.

608. We give here, once more, the Gothic bait, “I bit,” and baug, “I bowed,” over against the corresponding Sanskrit forms, but so that, varying from §. 489. and our usual method, we express the Sanskrit diphthongs रे and स्रो, according to their etymological value, by ai and au, in order

Grimm’s German Grammar, differs in this point from the view above taken, that he does not recognise in the i of biudu and in the first i of beita (=bīta, from biita) the weakening of the Sanskrit Guna vowel a, but endeavours in three different ways to gain from the radical i and u, in the present i (written ei in Gothic) and iu (Old High German Thesaurus I. pp. 21, 22), of which modes, however, none is so near and concise as that, according to which the i of biudu is the weakening of the a of the Sanskrit bauḍhāmi (contracted, bōdhāmi), to which biudu has the same relation that the Old High German dative suniu, “to the son,” has to the Gothic sunau and Sanskrit sūnāv-ē, from the base sūnu, the final u of which receives Guna in the dative singular and nominative plural. In the former place the Gothic has retained the old Guna a; and it is not till several centuries later that we first see this in Old High German weakened to i: in the latter place (in the nominative plural) the Gothic even has admitted the weakening to i, but changed it to y; hence sunyu-s for Sanskrit sūnāv-as.

* See §.70., and Vocalismus, p. 224, Remark 13.
to make the really astonishing agreement of the two lan-

[G. Ed. p. 855.] guages more apparent. We also annex
the Old High German, which replaces the Gothic diphthong ai
by ei, and au by ou (before T sounds, s and h by d). In the
Old High German it is especially important to remark, that it
replaces by the pure vowel of the root the diphthong in the sec-
cond person singular, on account of the dissyllabic form, which
here corresponds to the Gothic monosyllabic one, as a clear
proof that the vowel opposition between singular and plural
depends on the extent of the word or the weight of the ter-
minations, as we have already perceived by the opposition
between a in monosyllabic and the lighter u in polysyllabic
forms (bunt, bunti, buntunês, see §. 604.).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>bhid,</td>
<td>bit,</td>
<td>biz,</td>
<td>bhuj,</td>
<td>bug,</td>
<td>bug,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“to split,”</td>
<td>“to bite,”</td>
<td>“id.”</td>
<td>“to bend,”</td>
<td>“id.”</td>
<td>“id.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bhaid-a,</td>
<td>bait,</td>
<td>beiz.</td>
<td>bubhauj-a,</td>
<td>bauj,</td>
<td>bauj,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bhaid-i-tha,</td>
<td>bais-t,</td>
<td>biz-i.</td>
<td>bubhauj-i-tha,</td>
<td>bauj-t,</td>
<td>bauj-i.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bhaid-a,</td>
<td>bait,</td>
<td>beiz.</td>
<td>bubhauj-a,</td>
<td>bauj,</td>
<td>bauj,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bhaid-i-thus,</td>
<td>bit-u-t,</td>
<td>. . . .</td>
<td>bubhuj-a-thus,</td>
<td>bauj-u-t,</td>
<td>. . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bhaid-a-tus,</td>
<td>. . . .</td>
<td>. . . .</td>
<td>bubhuj-a-tus,</td>
<td>. . . .</td>
<td>. . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bhid-i-ma,</td>
<td>bit-u-m,</td>
<td>biz-u-mês.</td>
<td>bubhuj-i-ma,</td>
<td>bauj-u-m,</td>
<td>bauj-u-mês.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bhid-i-a',</td>
<td>bit-u-th,</td>
<td>biz-u t.</td>
<td>bubhuj-i-a',</td>
<td>bauj-u-th,</td>
<td>bauj-u-t.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bhid-us,</td>
<td>bit-u-n,</td>
<td>biz-u-n.</td>
<td>bubhuj-us,</td>
<td>bauj-u-n,</td>
<td>bauj-u-n.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 See §. 102. 2 See §. 441.

[G. Ed. p. 856.] 609. The Greek second perfects like πέταω, λέλοιπα, ἐσικα, πέφενγα, in respect to their Guna
answer to the Sanskrit just discussed, bhthuida (bhthida),
bubhauja (bubhôja), and Gothic bait, bauj. The circum-

...
stance, however, that the Greek retains the Guna in the dual and plural, and uses not *πεπίθαμεν*, *πεφύγαμεν*, but *πεποίθαμεν*, *πεφεύγαμεν*, raises a suspicion against the originality of the principle followed by the Sanskrit and German. We will therefore leave it undecided whether the Greek has extended inorganically to the plural numbers the Guna, which was created only for the singular, or whether the vowel strengthening of the reduplicated preterite were originally intended for the three numbers of the active; and the coincidence of the Sanskrit and German in this point be only accidental, that they have, in the tense under discussion, accorded to the weight of the terminations, or extent of the word, an influence in shortening the base-syllable. This influence is so natural, that it need not surprise us if two languages, in the course of time, had admitted it independently of each other, and then, in the operation of this influence, coincided; as, on one side, the Gothic *bitum*, *bugum*, answering to *bait*, *baug*, and, on the other side, the Sanskrit *bibhidima*, *bubhujima*, answering to *bibhaida*, *bubhauja*. The German obtains a separate individuality in that the Old High German, in the second person singular, employs *bizi*, *buij*, and not *beizi*, *bouyi*, on account of their being dissylabic; while the Sanskrit, in spite of their being of three syllables, uses *bibhaiditha*, *bubhaujitha*. It is certain that the Sanskrit, in its present state, has given to the weight of the personal terminations a far greater influence than could have existed at the period of the unity of language; and that, e.g., the Greek *δεδόρκαμεν*, with reference to the singular *δέδορκα*, stands nearer to the primitive condition of the language than the Sanskrit *dadrisima*, which has abbreviated the syllable *ar* of the singular *dadaria* to *ṛi*. Observe, [G. Ed. p. 857.] also, what has been remarked above regarding the retention of the Gothic *ō* and Greek *ā* or *η* in the dual and plural, while the Sanskrit exhibits the lengthening of a radical *a* to *ā* only in the first and third persons singular (§. 603.).
610. As to the personal terminations of the reduplicated preterite, they deserve especial consideration, since they do not answer exactly to the primary endings, nor to the secondary. The ground of their varying from the primary terminations, to which they most incline (in Greek more clearly than in Sanskrit), lies palpably in the root being incumbered with the syllable of reduplication, which in various places has produced an abbreviation or entire extinction of the personal terminations. The first and third person singular have the same sound in Sanskrit, and terminate with the vowel, which should properly be only the bearer of the personal termination. The Gothic has lost even this vowel; hence, above, baug, bait, answering to bubhauja (bubhója), bibhaida (bibhêda). The Greek, however, has, in the third person, corrupted the old α to ε, just as in the aorist, where we saw ἔδειξε answer to the Sanskrit adikṣhat. In the same way, in the perfect, τέτυφα, δέδορκα, &c. answer to the Sanskrit tutópa (=tutaupa), dadarsa; while in the first person, τέτυφα, δέδορκα, stand on the same footing with the Sanskrit tutópa, dadarsa (from dadarka). As three languages, the Sanskrit, Greek, and Gothic, and a fourth, the Zend (where dadarsa appears in the form ταζάμαναu dadarēśa), agree with one another in this, that in the first and third person of the tense under discussion they have lost the personal designation, it might be inferred that this loss occurred as early as the period of the unity of language. But this inference is not necessary; for in the incumbrance of the root by the syllable of reduplication there lies so natural an occasion for weakening the termin-
its Greek and German sisters; and our forms like ihr bisset, “ye bit,” ihr boget, “ye bent,” are more perfect in their termination at this day than what we can draw from the Sanskrit, to compare with them, from the oldest period of its literature. The Sanskrit reduplicated preterite has, for instance, lost the termination of the second person plural from the oldest time; and this person is therefore either completely the same with the first and third person singular, or distinguished from it only by the removal of the Guna, or by an abbreviation in the interior of the root from which the singular has remained free; e.g. the first and third person singular and second person plural of krat, “to weep,” are chakranda: in the two former places the Gothic gaigrót corresponds to it, and, indeed, shews to disadvantage through its loss of the final vowel: in the second person plural, however, gaigrót-u-th surpasses the Sanskrit chakrand-a, which has evidently been preceded by a form chakrand-a-tha or chakrand-a-ta. To tet yap-a-te, dédórk-α-te, in Greek, tutup-a, dadris-a, for tutup-a-tha, dadris-a-tha, correspond in Sanskrit.

611. The Sanskrit reduplicated preterite stands in disadvantageous comparison with the Greek perfect in this point also, that in the middle and passive it has not only, like the present, lost the m of the first person, but also the t of the third; thus, tutupé stands for tutup-mé and tutup-té, and in the former case is surpassed by tet yap-mu, in the latter by tet yaptau, as respects the correct preservation of the termination. From tet yap-mu, tet yap-tau, it may be inferred that the active was formerly tet yap-am, tet yapati, or tet yap-am, tet yap-α-ri, and in Sanskrit tut dp-a-mi (or tut dp-d-mi, see §. 434.), tut dp-a-ti. The conjunctive vowel is suppressed in Greek before the weightier terminations of the middle passive, according to the principle by which the η of the optative, and the corresponding ḍ of the Sanskrit potential, is dropped in the middle, and, e.g., ḍl̄doimetha, dadimahi, correspond to the active ḍl̄doim ev, dadyâma. The Sanskrit, in the middle and the
passive, which in this tense is fully identical with the middle, prefixes to the personal terminations beginning with a consonant for the most part a conjunctive vowel i (see § 605. p. 846 G. ed.); hence tutup-i-shê answering to the Greek τέτυμ-σαν. Yet in the Vêda-dialect the form tutup-sê might be expected, as this dialect often suppresses the conjunctive vowel of the common language, and, e.g., in the Rig Vêda (XXXII. 4.), from vid, class 6, "to find," the form vivit-sê, "thou didst find," occurs for the common vivid-i-ṣhê.

612. The third person plural of the middle passive exhibits in Sanskrit the termination rê, which, in the common language, is always preceded by the conjunctive vowel i, which, however, may be withdrawn in the Vêda-dialect, where, e.g., dadris-rê, "they were seen," occurs for dadrisirê (Rig Vêda, XXIV. 10.). It is hardly possible to give a satisfactory explanation of this termination. I have elsewhere (Lesser Sanskrit Grammar, § 372. Rem. 4.) remarked, that its r is perhaps a corruption of an original s, which otherwise, in Sanskrit, occurs only in the terminating sound, and regularly, indeed, before sonant letters, in case a vowel other than a or ã precedes the s. This being the case, this r would belong to the verb substantive; and we should remark, that in Greek, also, this verb, in certain tenses, is found only in the third [G. Ed. p. 860.] person plural, while the rest are simple (ἐδίδοσαν, ἐδοσαν). The Sanskrit intended probably, in the case before us—if the r really stands for s—by this change to lighten the sound, as occurs in the Old High German, where, in all roots in is and us, and in part of the roots in as, the radical sibilant in thepreterite is retained only in the monosyllabic forms, but in the polysyllabic is weakened to r; hence, from RIS, "to fall" (Sanskrit bhraüs), reis, riri, reis, virumes, &c.; from LUS, "to lose," lös, lurī (see § 608.), los, lurumês, &c.; from was, "I was," "he was," comes the second person wâri, the plural wârumês, &c.

613. With the r of the Sanskrit termination rê is
clearly connected that of the termination *ran* of the third person plural, middle, of the potential and precative, where *ran*, in my opinion, is an abbreviation of *ranta*; and also the *r*, which the root *śi*, "to lie" (Greek *keіμασ*), inserts, in the third person plural of all special tenses (*sēratē*, "they lie," *aśrata* "they lay," *śratām*, "let them lie"). The root *vid*, "to know," class 2, in combination with the preposition *sam*, admits at will the addition of such an *r* in the present, imperfect, and imperative; hence, *saṇvidratē* or *saṇvidatē*, "they know" (Pāṇini VII. 1. 7.). The Vēda-dialect gives to the addition of this enigmatical *r*, in the middle and passive, a still wider extension (Pāṇini VII. 1. 8.), and exhibits *aduhra*, "they milked," for *aduhrata*, instead of the common *aduhata*. Remarkable, also, are the forms अद्रिश्राति adrisraṁ and अस्रूण asrijraṁ, from अस्रूण adrisranta, अस्रूण [G.Ed. p. 861.] asrigranta, for *adrisanta*, *asrijanta*. The Anuswāra of this Vēdic termination *raṁ*, which may have formerly *raṁs* (with *s* from *t*, compare p. 754 G. ed.), passes into *m* before vowels: hence, Rig Vēda IX. 4, अत्राव्रम् इन्द्र ते गिराः asrigram Indra tē girāḥ "effusi sunt, Indra! tibi hymni"; L. 3. अद्रिश्राति अस्त्र केरतो वि रस्मयो जनान चनु adrisram asya kēlavō vi rasmayo jandī anu "conspiciuntur ejus collustrantes radii inter homines."†

614. The conjunctive vowel *i*, which the middle uses in

* The former is an aorist of the sixth formation, from the root *driś*, which is not used in the special tenses; but *asrigrāṁ*, in which the retention of the original guttural instead of the palatal of the common language is to be noticed, does not, in my opinion, admit of being explained as an aorist, as Westergaard makes it, but appears to me to be an imperfect; as the roots of the sixth class, when they do not insert a nasal in the special tenses, are incapable of the sixth aorist formation, because they would not be distinguishable from the imperfect. Why should not the imperfect, as well as the aorist, be capable of replacing the termination *anta* by *ran*?

† Compare Westergaard, Radices, p. 209. Rosen takes adrisraṁ actively, and, in the first passage, asrigram, as the first person singular active, which, however, will not do. Preterites with a present signification are very common in the Vēdas.
almost all persons, may formerly have been an a; and it is still more probable that the active everywhere had, as in Greek, an a as conjunctive vowel; that therefore the form tutup-i-ma was preceded by a form tutup-a-ma (or tutup-á-ma, see §. 434.), as analogous to the Greek τετυφ-α-μεν;—an opinion which is also corroborated by the Gothic u-m, as in gaigrót-u-m, “we wept,” which leads us to expect a Sanskrit chakrand-a-ma or á-ma for chakrand-i-ma, since the Gothic u very often occurs as the weakening of an original a, but not as the increase of an original i.

615. In the second and third person dual the Sanskrit has firmly retained the old conjunctive vowel a; but the a of the primary terminations thas, tas, has been weakened to u, probably on account of the root being encumbered by the syllable of reduplication: hence, tutup-a-thus, tutup-a-lus, correspond to the Greek τετυφ-ά-τον, τετυφ-ά-τον from -τος, τος, see §. 97.); and chakrand-a-thus, “ye two wept,” to the

[G. Ed. p. 862.] Gothic gaigrót-u-ts of the same import. The w a of these dual forms is never suppressed, and hence is regarded by grammarians as belonging to the termination itself, while the terminations va and ma of the first person dual and plural occasionally occur, also in direct combination with the root; as from sidh, “ to stop,” come both sishidhiva, sishidhima, and sishidhwa, sishidhma. Thus we find in Greek, also, the a occasionally suppressed before the heavier terminations of the dual and plural. To this class belong, besides, ἵσμεν for οἴδαμεν (see §. 491. p. 711 G. ed.), ἔσριμεν, ἔικτον, ἀνωγμεν, δέδιμεν. But on these forms no special relationship is to be based, but only a coincidence of principle; for in the operation of the law of gravity it is so natural that two languages should, independently of one another, free themselves before heavy terminations of an auxiliary vowel, not indispensable for the idea to be conveyed, that it is quite unnecessary to assume here an old transmission.
FORMATION OF TENSES.

616. With regard to the termination \( \chi \, tha \) of the second person singular, we refer to §. 453. It may be here additionally remarked, that if the Greek \( \tilde{\eta}\sigma-\theta\alpha \)—which is there referred to असिष्य \( ds-i-tha \), for which would stand, without the vowel of conjunction, \( ds-tha \)—is not a remnant of the perfect, but actually belongs to the imperfect, the Sanskrit middle imperfect अस्थवह \( asthas \) would admit of comparison with it. But I prefer referring this \( \tilde{\eta}\sigma\theta\alpha \) to the perfect, and placing it on the same footing with \( \sigma\sigma-\theta\alpha \), which, with respect to its termination, corresponds so well with वेष्य \( vēl-tha \) and the Gothic \( vaei-t \). The Old High German also, which, in its strong preterites, has preserved only the conjunctive vowel of the Sanskrit \( i-tha \), and hence opposes to the Sanskrit बुभाज \( bhuβαj-i-tha \) (\( bhuβάj-i-tha \)) and Gothic \( baug-t \), \( \text{“thou didst bow,”} \) the form \( bug-i \), has in preterites, which, like the Sanskrit \( vēda \), Greek \( oί̇da \), and Gothic \( vait \), have present signification, retained the old \( t \) in direct combination with the root; as, \( w \, is-t \) (euphonic for \( weiz-t \)) corresponds to the Gothic \( vais-t \), Greek \( oί̇s-\theta\alpha \), and Sanskrit \( vēl-tha \) (\( vait-tha \)). We must likewise class here \( muo-st \), \( \text{“thou must,”} \) \( tōh-t \), \( \text{“thou art fit,”} \*) \( mah-t \), \( \text{“thou canst,”} \) \( scal-t \), \( \text{“thou shouldst,”} \) \( an-s-t \), \( \text{“thou art inclined,”} \) \( \text{“dost not grudge”} \) (with euphonic \( s \), see §. 95.: the form cannot be cited, but is indubitable), \( chan-s-t \), \( \text{“thou canst,”} \) \( \text{“thou knowest,”} \) \( getars-t \), \( \text{“thou venturest,”} \)† \( darf-t \), \( \text{“thou requirest.”} \)

617. It deserves further to be remarked with respect to the Gothic, that the roots terminating with a vowel prefix an \( s \) to the \( t \) of the second person: at least the second person

* Does not occur, but can be safely deduced from the third person \( touk \) and the preterite \( tōh-ta \).

† The \( s \) is not, as I formerly assumed, euphonic (§. 94.), but belongs to the root, which, before vowels, assimilates its \( s \) to the preceding \( r \) (as Greek \( διππος, βαππίω \) rejected when in the terminating sound, but preserved before \( t \) : hence, in the first and third person singular \( ge-tar \), third person plural \( ge-turren, ge-turren \). In Sanskrit \( dharṣ \) (\( dhriṣ \)), \( \text{“to venture,”} \) in Lithuanian, \( drys-ti \), \( \text{“idem”} \) corr spond., comp. Pott, I. 270, Graff, V. 441.
of sais5d, “I sowed,” is sais5d-st, (Luke xix. 21.); from which we may also infer vaiv5d-st, from the root $\bar{V}\bar{O}$, “to blow” (Sanskrit va), and lai5d-st, from L$\bar{O}$, “to laugh.” As to the relation of the ai of the present (vaia, laia, saia) to the $\partial$ of the preterite and of the root, it resembles that of binda, “I bind,” to BAND; i.e. as the a of this and similar roots has weakened itself in the present to i, the same has been done by the latter half of the $\partial=\partial$, or a+a. In the same way, in Sanskrit, a long $\partial$ is sometimes weakened to $\varepsilon=ai$; e.g. in the vocative of the feminine bases in $\partial$ (see §. 205.). But to return to the Gothic root S$\bar{O}$, I am not inclined to infer from the third person present saiy-i-th, which actually occurs (Mark iv. 14.), a first person saiya, but believe, that only before i a y is added to the diphthong ai, and that the

[G. Ed. p. 864.] third person singular and second person plural of vaia and laia also must be vai5j5th, lai5j5th, and the second person singular vai5jis, lai5jis. But if the root S$\bar{O}$ had, in the first person singular, formed saiya, then the third person plural would certainly have been sai5jand, the infinitive sai5yan, and the present participle sai5jands; on the other hand, at Matth.* iv. 26. occurs sai5jand, “they sow”; l. c. 4, 5, sai5jands, “the sower,” and sai5jan, “to sow.”

618. The Sanskrit roots in $\partial$ (the analogy of which is followed by those also with a final diphthong, which are, for the most part, dealt with in the general tenses as if they ended with $\partial$) employ in the first and third persons $\partial$u for $\partial$ or a, for the $\partial$ of the root should be melted down with the a of the termination to $\partial$, or be dropped as before the other terminations beginning with a vowel. Instead of this, however, $\partial$u is used; e.g. ददा daddu, “I gave,” “he gave,” from d$\partial$; टस्थति tasth$\partial$u, “I stood,” “he stood,” from sthd$\partial$. If $\partial$u was found only in the first person, I should not hesitate

* So in the German; but as there are not 26 verses in the 4th chap. of Matth., the reference is probably to chap. vi 26., and the next reference should be Mark iv. 3.
recognising in the Ł the vocalization of the personal character 

m, as in the Gothic siyau, "I may be," answering to the Sanskrit \textit{syām} syām, and in Lithuanian forms in \textit{au} (§. 438.). This view of the matter, however, appears less satisfactory, if we are compelled to assume that the termination \textit{du}, after its meaning had been forgotten, and the language had lost sight of its derivation, had found its way inorganically into the third person, though such changes of person are not unheard of in the history of language; as, in the Gothic passive, where the first and third persons have likewise the same termination, but reversed through the transposition of the ending of the third person to the first, and, in the plural, also into the second (§. 466.). But if the termination \textit{du} of dudāu, "\textit{dedi}, \textit{dedit}," stands with the same right in the third person that it does in the first, and no personal ending is contained in it, then the \textit{u} of the diphthong \textit{du} may be regarded as the weakening of the common [G. Ed. p. 865.] termination, or conjunctive vowel \textit{a}; so that the \textit{u}, according to the principle of \textit{Vṛiddhi}, would have united with the preceding \textit{d} into \textit{du} (see §. 29.); while in the ordinary contractions an \textit{a} is shortened before its combination with \textit{u} or \textit{i} to \textit{a}, and then, with \textit{u}, becomes \textit{a}=\textit{au}, and with \textit{i}, \textit{a}=\textit{ai}.

619. The Sanskrit verbs of the tenth class, and all derivative verbs, periphrastically express the reduplicated preterite by one of the auxiliary verbs—\textit{kṛi} "to make," \textit{as} and \textit{bhā}, "to be"—the reduplicated preterites of which are referable to the accusative of an abstract substantive in \textit{ā}, which is not used in the other cases, before which the character \textit{ā} of the tenth class and of the causal forms is retained; \textit{e.g.} chōrayāṅchakāra (euphonic for chōryām-ch-), "he made stealing," or chōrayāmāsa, or chōrayāmbabhbāva,* "he was to steal." The opinion expressed in the first

* The root \textit{bhā} irregularly contains in the syllable of repetition an \textit{a} instead of the shortened radical vowel, omits in the first and third
edition of my Sanskrit Grammar, that the form in *dm*
must be regarded as the accusative of an abstract sub-
stantive, I have since found is supported by the Zend, where
the corresponding form occurs as an infinitive in the ac-
cusative relation, as I have already shewn by citing the
following lucid passage (Vend. S. p. 198.): *

>JJAS(?

If the worshippers of Mazda wish to make

[G. Ed. p. 806.] the earth grow (cultivate).” The San-
skrit, instead of *kri*, “to make,” occasionally uses another
verb of similar import, to paraphrase the reduplicated pre-
terite. Thus we read in the Mahâbhârat (I.1809.): *

>JJAS(?

“they solicited Vapûšhtamâ;” literally, “they made soli-
citation on account of Vapûšhtamâ,” or “they went to a
solicitation;” for *pra-kram* means, properly, “to go;” but
verbs of motion frequently take the place of those of mak-
ing, since the completion of an action is represented as
the going to it.

person singular the Guna or Vriddhi augment, and changes irregularly its
*ù* before vowels into *ūv* instead of *uv*.

* Thus I read for the l. c. occurring *raodhyanim*, for which, p. 299,
*raodhayen* occurs: the two forms guided me in restoring the right reading,
which has since been confirmed by Burnouf, by comparing MSS. Anque-
til translates thus, “lorsque les Mazdâïens veulent creuser des ruisseaux
dedans et autour d’une terre ;” in accordance with which I before rendered
the expression *raodhyanim* by “*perforare.*” It is, however, probably the
causal form of *raodh*, “to grow” (compare Burnouf’s Yaçaña, Notes,
p. xxxx.), which is based on the Sanskrit *ruh* from *ruh* (see §.23.), and
with which the Gothic *LUD*, “to grow,” *lauths, laudis, “man” (our
*Leute*), is connected. It is possible that this causal form may have as-
sumed, in Zend, the meaning “to bury,” as one of the means of growth.
This, however, is of not much importance to us here: it suffices to know,
what is very important, that *raodhyanim* supplies the place of an infini-
tive, has an accusative termination, and confirms my explanation of the
Sanskrit form under discussion.
620. It is very important to observe, that it is the verbs of the tenth class, causal forms, and other derivative verbs, which particularly employ this periphrastic formation of the reduplicated preterite, and do not admit the simple formation; for hereby the way is, in a manner, prepared for the German idioms, which, without exception, paraphrase their preterite by an auxiliary verb signifying "to do," precisely in that conjugation in which we have recognised the Sanskrit tenth class in three different forms (see §§. 109*. 6. 504.). I have asserted this, as regards the Gothic, already in my System of Conjugation (pp. 151, &c.), where I have shewn, in plurals like sōkidēdum, "we sought," (did seek), and in the subjunctive in the singular also (sōkidēdyau, "I would do seek") an auxiliary verb signifying "to do," and [G. Ed. p. 867.] a word related to dēths, "the act,"* (theme dédi). Since then, Grimm, with whom I fully coincide, has extended the existence of the auxiliary verb also to the singular sōkida, and therefore to the other dialects; for if in sōkida the verb "to do" is contained, it is self-evident that it exists also in our suchte. I had before derived the singular sōkida from the passive participle sokiths (theme sōkida). But since I now recognise the verb (thun) "to do" also in sōkida, "I sought," I believe—in which I differ from Grimm—that we must, in respect to their origin, fully separate from one another the passive participle and the indicative preterite,† great as the agreement of the two forms is, which, in Gothic, amounts to complete identity; for the theme of sokiths, "the sought," is sōkida (see §. 135.), thus fully the same as sōkida, "I sought;" and salbōda, the theme of salbōths, "the anointed," is in

* It is preserved only in missa-dēths, "misdeed," but is etymologically identical with the German That, Old High German tāt, Old Saxon dūd.
† Compare my Vocalismus, pp. 51, &c.
form identical with salboda, "I anointed." This circumstance, too, was likely to mislead, that participles in da (nominative ths) occur only in verbs which form their preterites in da, while in strong verbs the passive participle terminates in na (nominative ns), and, e.g., bug-a-ns, "bent" (theme bug-a-na), corresponds to the Sanskrit bhug-na-s. In Sanskrit, however, passive participles in na are comparatively rare, and the vast majority of verbs form them by the suffix ta,* on which the Latin tu-s, Greek τός [G. Ed. p. 863.] (πλεκτός, ποιητός), Lith. ta-s (suk-ta-s, "turned"), are based. This suffix has, however, nothing in common with the verb thun, "to do," under discussion; and therefore, also, the Gothic suffix da of SŌK-I-DA, sōkiths, can have nothing to do with the da of sōkida, "I sought," provided that this da signifies "I did," just as dēdum in sōkidēdum means "we did," and dē-ths, "the deed."

621. The just-mentioned dē-ths;† to which the Old Saxon dād and Old High German tāt correspond, is, in the theme, dēdi, the i of which is suppressed in the nominative (see §. 135.): the genitive is dēdai-s, the accusative plural dēdi-ns. The final syllable of the base dēdi corresponds to the Sanskrit suffix ti, which forms abstract substantives, and, in Gothic, occurs under the form of ti, thi, or di, according to the measure of the letter preceding

* Compare tyak-ta-s, "forsaken," kri-ta-s, "made," bri-ta-s, "borne." I remark, en passant, that the Latin la-tus might become connected with britas, from bhartas, in the same way as latus, "broad," with prithu-s, πλατύς: thus, the labial being lost, r being exchanged with l, and al transposed to la = ra, as, in Greek, ἐράκων for ἐκάρκον.

† I write the non-occurring nominative dēth, not dēds, since d after vowels, before a final s, and at the end of words, generally becomes th; hence, also, sōkiths, "sought," from the base sōkida, and mannasēths, "world," literally "human-seed," from the base sē-di and the root sō, "to sow" (saia, saisō, see §. 617.). Sēād has the same relation to sō, in regard to its radical vowel, that tēka, "I touch," has to the preterite taitāk.
it (see §. 91.). There remains, therefore, dé, in Old Saxon dā, in Old High German tä, as the root, and this regularly corresponds to the Sanskrit-Zend ḍa dhadā, ṣa dā, "to set," "to make" (see p. 112); from which might be expected an abstract substantive पातिस् ḍhā-ti-s, ṣa ḍā-ti-s, which would answer to the Greek θέσις (from θέτις). It is a question, then, whether, in the Gothic dēdum of sōkidēdum, the first syllable is fully identical with that of DĒ-DI, "the deed"? I think it is not; and consider dēdum, and the subjunctive dēdya, plural dēdeima, as reduplicated forms; so that thus the second syllable of dēdum, dēdya, would be to be compared with the first of DĒ-DI, "deed." The dé of dēdum, "we did," dē-dya, "I would [G. Ed. p. 869.] do," considered as the syllable of reduplication, is distinguished from the common reduplicated preterites like vai-vō-um, "we blew," sai-sō-um, "we sowed," taitōkum, "we touched," by its ē for ai. It may be, then, that this ē, which has proceeded from ai, is the contraction of a + i to a mixed sound, according to the Sanskrit principle (see §. 2.); or that, according to an older principle of reduplication, the ē of dē-dum, just like that of DĒ-DI, "deed," represents the original long ē of the Sanskrit root dhā (see §. 69.), which is retained unchanged in the Old High German tä, and Old Saxon dād. In the last syllable of dē-dum, dē-dya, we miss the radical vowel: according to the analogy of vai-vō-um, sai-sō-um, we should expect dēdā-um. The abbreviation may be a consequence of the incumbrance owing to composition with the principal verb: however, it occurs in Sanskrit, even in the simple word; since, in the reduplicated preterite, da-dh-i-ma, "we did set," da-dh-us, "they did set," are correctly used for da-dhā-i-ma, dudhā-us (see p. 846 G. ed.). Even in the present, the root dhā, which, as a verb of the third class, has reduplication in the special tenses also, with dā, class 3, "to give," irregularly reject the radical vowel before the heavy terminations of the dual and
plural; thus, dadh-mas for dadhā-mas; just so, in the whole potential mood, where dadh-yām (for dadhā-yām), "ponam," answers remarkably to the Gothic dēd-yau (from sōkidēd-yau, "I would do," for dēdō-yau.

622. The singular of sōkidēdum, sōkidēduth, sōkidēdun, is sōkida, sōkidēs, sōkida, with the loss of the syllable of reduplication. Yet dés is perhaps an abbreviation of desta, as, in the preterite, t, answering to the Sanskrit व tha, is properly the character of the second person (see §. 453.), before which a radical T-sound passes, according to §. 102., into s; as, bais-t, bans-t, for bai-t, band-t. So, also, dés [G. Ed. p. 870.] might have proceeded from dés-t, and this from dēd-t. In the simple state, the auxiliary verb under discussion is wanting in Gothic; at least, it does not occur in Ulfilas; but in Old Saxon dō-m, dō-s, dō-t (or dō-d), correspond admirably to the Sanskrit dadhā-mi, dadhā-si, dadhā-ti, with ṝ for a, according to the Gothic principle (see §. 69.), and with the suppression of the syllable of reduplication, which, as has been already remarked, the Sanskrit verb, according to the principle of the third class, exhibits, like the Greek τίθημι, in the present also. The preterite in Old Saxon, as in all the other German dialects, has preserved the reduplication, and is, dēda, dēdō-s, dēda, plural dēdun, also dādun,* properly the third person, which, in the Old Saxon preterite, as in the Gothic passive (§. 466.), represents both the first and second person. In this dēd-u-n or dād-u-n, therefore, the radical vowel, as in the Gothic sōkidēdun (for sōkidēdō-u-n), is dropped before the conjunctive vowel. The ē of dēda, &c., has arisen from i, which has been actually retained in Anglo-Saxon. Here the preterite under discussion has dide, didest, dide, plural didon, in the three persons. These forms, therefore, in respect to their reduplication syllable, answer to the pre-

* See Schmeller's Glossarium Saxonicum, p. 25.
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terites with concealed reduplication, as Old High German hi-alt for hihalt (see §. 592.). The Old Saxon dâdun, which occurs in the plural, together with dëdun, as also in the second person singular dâdi is found together with dëdô-s (see Schmeller’s Gloss.), is inorganic, and follows the analogy of Grimm’s tenth and eleventh conjugations; i. e. it is produced in the feeling, as if dad were the root and first and third person of the singular preterite, and the present were didu. Thus, also, in the subjunctive, with dëdi the form dâdi exists. In Old High German, also, the forms which have a long â in the conjugations named, employ this \[G. Ed. p. 871.\] letter in the auxiliary verb under discussion, and, indeed, without a dissentient authority,* without, however, in a single one, the first and third person singular being tat, as might have been expected from the second person tâti (like sâzi answering to saz, see the second table in §. 605.). I annex the preterite in full, according to Grimm; têta, tâtî, têta; tâtumës, tâlut, tâmun; subjunctive tâti, tâtîs, tâli; tâtûmes. tâtît, tâtîn. The present is tuo-m, tuo-s, tuo-t, tuo-mès, tuo-t, tuo-nt; which, in its way, answers to the Sanskrit da-dhâmî, just as well as the Old Saxon dâ-m, &c.; since uo, in Old High German, is the most common representative of the Gothic and Old Saxon õ, and therefore of the Sanskrit â; as, in fuor, answering to the Gothic fôr and Sanskrit châr, from chachâra, “I went,” “he went.” The Middle High German is, in the present, tuo-n, tuo-st, tuo-t; tuo-n, tuo-t, tuo-nt: in the preterite, tête, tête, tête; plural, tâten, tâtet, tâten: subjunctive tête, &c. Our German that, thûle, follow exactly the analogy of forms like trat, trûte, las, lûse (Grimm’s tenth conjugation), and would lead us to expect a present

---

* See Graff, V, 287., where, however, remark that very few authorities distinguish graphically the long a from the short.

† Also tît and tête, the latter inorganic, and as if the first e had not been produced from i, but, by Umlaut, from a. See Grimm, I. p. 965.
thete from thite; the recollection of a reduplication which is contained in that is completely destroyed, but just as much so the possibility of connection with the weak preterites like suchte, to which recourse must be had, if we wish to reject the opinion first given by Grimm (I. p. 1042), but not firmly held by him, that the Old Saxon dēda, Anglo-Saxon dide, Old High German teīta, Middle High German teīte, rest on reduplication.* The passive participle gi-tā-nēr, ge-tha-nēr,

[G. Ed. p. 872.] answers to the Sanskrit like mld-nā, “withered,” from mldī (mldā), or dā-na, “gift” (properly “that given”), from dā, of which the common participle is datta (from dudāta), the reduplication being irregularly retained. The Sanskrit tenth class agrees with the German weak conjugation (the prototype of which it is) in this point, that it never forms its passive participles in na, but always in ta; on which is based the Gothic da of SŌKIDA, nominative masculine sōkiths, “sought.”

623. To return to the Gothic sōkida, “I sought,” “did seek,” after acknowledging in the ya of sōkya, “I seek,” the character of the Sanskrit tenth class या aya, and in sōki-da, “I did seek,” a copy of the Sanskrit chōrayān-chakāra (or chakara), “I did steal,” we now consider the i of sōkida as the contraction of the syllable ya, in which we agree with Grimm. The i of sōkida, therefore, represents the Sanskrit ayām of chōrayān-chakāra (ऋ n euphonic for m), “I did steal”; or, in order to select kindred verbs, the i of the Gothic sali of sati-da, “I did place,” corresponds to

* The substantive dē-ths (theme dē-di), tā-t, cannot stand in our way, since its formation has nought to do with the reduplication, nor with the weak conjugation; but here dē, tā, are the root, and di, ti, the derivation-suffix mentioned in §. 91. Nor can the participle gi-tā-nēr, ki-tā-nēr, ge-tha-nēr, induce us to look for passive participles in the weak conjugations like gi-salbō-tāner instead of gi-salbōtēr, ge-salbter, because we make this participle independent of the auxiliary verb thun (compare Vocalismus, p. 77).
the Sanskrit *ayám* (or rather, only its *y*) of *sādayān-chakārā*, “I made to sit”; the Gothic *thani* of *thani-da*, “I extended,” corresponds to the Sanskrit *tānuyām* of *tānayān-chakārā*, “I did make to extend”; the Gothic *vasi*, of *vasi-da*, “I did clothe,” corresponds to the Sanskrit *vāsayām* of *vāsayān-chakārā*, “I did cause to be clothed” (*vāsayaṃi*, “I cause to clothe,” as causal of *vas*, “to clothe”). It might be conjectured that the first member of the Gothic [G. Ed. p. 873.] compounds under discussion originally, in like manner, carried an accusative-termination, just as in idea it is an accusative. As, that is to say, in the present state of the language, Gothic substantives have entirely lost the accusative sign, it would not surprise us to find it wanting in these compounds also. At an earlier period of the language, *satin-da*, *thanin-da*, *vasin-du*, may have corresponded to the Sanskrit *sādayām*, *tānuyām*, *vāsayaṃ*, the *m* of which before the *ch* of the auxiliary verb must become ढ n. The selection of another auxiliary verb in German, but which has the same meaning, cannot surprise us, as the Sanskrit also, occasionally, as has been already shewn, employs another verb for the idea of “doing” (see p. 866 G. ed.), or uses in its place the verb substantive *as* or *bhū*.

624. Grimm’s second conjugation of the weak form, of which *sulbō* is given as example, has, as has already been observed, cast out, like the Latin first conjugation, the semi-vowel which holds the middle place in the Sanskrit *aya* of the tenth class, and the two short *a* then touching one another coalesce, in Gothic, into *ə = a + a*, as, in Latin, into *a*. Hence, in the preterite, Gothic forms like *sulbō-da*, “I did anoint,” correspond to the Sanskrit like *chōrayān-chakārā*, “I did steal”; as *laigō*, from *laigō-da*, “I did lick,” answers to the Sanskrit *lēhayām* (= *laihayām*) from *lēhayān-chakārā*, “I did cause to lick.” It must not be forgotten that the Sanskrit tenth class is at the same time the form of causal verbs, which admit of being formed from all roots; hence, also, in
Grimm's third class of the weak conjugation (which has preserved the two first letters of the Gothic *aya* in the form of *ai*, in accordance with the Latin *ē* of the second conjugation,


625. In Sanskrit, besides the tenth class and derivative verbs, there are verbs which paraphrase the reduplicate preterite by forming directly from the root an abstract substantive in *ā*, and combining with its accusative one of the above-mentioned auxiliary verbs. All roots, for instance, do this, which begin with vowels which are long either naturally or by position, with the exception of an *ā* long by position, and the root *āp*, "to obtain," as *iśān-chakāra*, "I did rule," from *iś*, "to rule." Compare with this the Gothic *brah-ta*, "I brought," answering to the strong present *brigya* (*bringa*). Compare, moreover, the paraphrased preterites, to which, instead of the present, a simple preterite with present meaning corresponds (see §. 616.), and which, in the preterite, just like *brah-ta*, combine the auxiliary verb *thun* direct with the root, in which junction its *T* sound is governed by the final consonants of the principal verb; and in Gothic appears at one time as *t*, at another as *th*, at another as *d* (compare §. 91.), and after the *t* of *VIT*, "to know," as *s* (see §. 102.): hence, *mōs-ta*, "I must," (preterite) (*mōl*, "I must," (present)); *muntha*, "I meant" (man, "I mean"); *skul-da*, "I should" (skal, "I should," (present)); *vis-sa*, for *vis-ta*, "I knew" (vait, "I

---

* See p. 110.

† The Gothic verb, also, is, according to its meaning, a causal from a lost primitive, which, in Old High German, in the first person present, is *bim*, see §. 510.
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know,” see §. 491). A few weak verbs, also, with the derivative ya, suppress its representative i, and annex the auxiliary verb direct to the root. They are, in [G. Ed. p. 875.] Gothic, but four, viz. thah-ta, “I thought” (present, thagkya); bauh-ta, “I bought” (with au for u, according to §. 82, present bugya); vaehr-ta, “I made” (present vaerkya); thuh-ta, “it appeared” (thugk, “it appears”). The Old High German, however, usually suppresses the derivative i after a long radical syllable, and with the cause disappears also the effect, viz. the Umlaut produced by the i (see §. 73.), in as far as the original vowel is an a: hence, nan-ta,* “I named”; wan-ta,† “I turned”; lær-ta, “I taught”; answering to the Gothic namni-da, vandi-da, laisi-da. These, and similar verbs, have also, in the present and the forms depending on it, lost the y or i of the derivative ya,† but have preserved the Umlaut, whence it is clear, that the y or i must have here adhered much longer than in the preterite (nennu, wendu, lěru).

626. The passive participle in Gothic, with respect to the suppression or retention of the derivative i, and with regard to the euphonic change of the final consonant of the root, always keeps equal pace with the preterite active. We may therefore infer from the Gothic ōh-ta, “I feared,” a participial base of a similar sound, ōh-ta, “feared,” nominative ohts, though this participle cannot be cited as [G. Ed. p. 876.]

* For nunn-ta, see §. 102.
† For wand-ta, see §. 102. I consider this verb as identical with the Sanskrit vart (vṛt), “to go,” “to be” (with the preposition ni, “to return”), and the Latin verto, with exchange of the liquids r and n. This does not prevent the German werden being referred to the root vart, as it often happens that a root separates into different forms with distinct meanings.
† As the Old High German does not distinguish the y from i it cannot be known whether the neriu, neriamēs, which correspond to the Gothic nasya, “I save,” nasyam, “we save,” should be pronounced neryu, ner-yamēs or neriu, neriamēs, though at the oldest period y was certainly the pronunciation.
occurring. Together with vaurh-ta, "I made," from vaurkya, a participle vaurhts, "made" (theme vaurhta), Mark xiv. 59. exists; and with fra-bauh-ta, "I sold," from frabugya is found fra-bauhts, "sold," John xii. 5. From such euphonic coincidences, however, we cannot deduce an historical descent of the passive participle from the preterite active, or vice versa; just as little as it could be said, that, in Latin, the participles in tus and turus, and the nouns of agency in tor, really proceed from the supine, because from doctum, monitum, may be inferred doctus, monitus, docturus, moniturus, doctor, monitor. It is natural that suffixes, which begin with one and the same letter, even if they have nothing in common in their origin, should still, in external analogy, approach one another, and combine similarly with the root. In German, indeed, the auxiliary verb thun, and the suffix of the passive participle, if we recur to their origin, have different initial sounds, as the former rests on the Sanskrit ध dhā, the latter on the suffix त ta: but inasmuch as the latter, in Gothic, instead of becoming tha, according to the law for the permutation of sounds, has, with the preceding derivative vowel, assumed the form da, it is placed on the same footing with the auxiliary verb, which * regularly commences with d, and is consequently subject to the same fate. The same is the case with the suffix of abstract substantives, which is, in Sanskrit, ti, but in Gothic, after vowels, di, and after consonants, according to their nature, either ti, thi, or di; and thus may also, from the preterite mah-ta, "I could," be deduced a substantive mah-ts (theme mah-ti), "might," without the latter proceeding from the former.

[G. Ed. p. 877.] 627. We must therefore reject the opinion, that, in the Gothic sōkida, "I sought," and sōkiths (theme sōki-da), "the sought," sōkida (theme sōkidd), "the sought" (fem.)

* The Sanskrit dh leads us to expect the Greek θ and Gothic d.
stand to one another in the relation of descent; and I still persist in my assertion, already made in my System of Conjugation, and in my Review of Grimm's German Grammar (Vocalismus, p. 72), that, in Persian, preterites like bur-dam, "I bore," bas-tum, "I bound," purs-i-dam, "I asked," are derived from their corresponding participles, which have both a passive and an active signification. While, in Sanskrit, bṛi-ta (nominative masculine bṛitas) has merely a passive meaning, and only neuter verbs use the forms in ta with an active signification,* in Persian, bur-dah means both "borne" and, actively, "having borne"; and the perfect is expressed in Persian by using the verb substantive with the participle just mentioned; thus burdah am,† "I have borne," or, literally, "I am having borne," I consider, however, the aorist burdam as a contraction of burdah am, which need not surprise us, as the Persian very generally combines its verb substantive with both substantives and adjectives; e.g. mardam, "I am a man," buzurgam, "I am great." In the third person singular burd, or āurdah, stands without the addition of the auxiliary verb, as, in Sanskrit, bharatā, "laturus," is used in the sense of laturus, a, um, est; while the first and second persons of the three numbers combine the singular nominative masculine with the verb substantive, bhartāsmi, "I shall carry," &c. If we do not choose to recognise the verb substantive in the Persian aorist burdam, because in the present, with the exception of the third person ast, it is so much compressed that it is nowise distinguished from the terminations of other verbs,‡ [G. Ed. p. 878.] we must conclude that the simple annexation of the personal

---

* Comp. gata-s, "qui vivit"; so bhūta-s, "the having been" (masculine).
† In the original, berdeh em, but according to the English system these vowels would be given as above.
‡ Compare am, "I am," t, "thou art," im, "we are," id, "ye are," and, "they are," with baram ("I bear"), barī, barīm, barīd, barand. To and corresponds the Doric évrī for sēvrī; to am the English am (=em).
terminations to the participle, which is robbed of its ending ath forms the tense under discussion. This, however, is not my opinion: and it seems to me far more natural to explain burd’am as literally meaning “having borne am I” than to raise burd to the rank of a secondary verbal root, and, as such, to invest it with the personal terminations, as they appear in the present.

628. The Slavonic languages, with the exception of the Old Slavonic and Servian (see §§. 561. &c.), present, in the formation or paraphrasing of the preterite, a remarkable coincidence with the Persian. The participle, which, in Persian, terminates in dah or tah, and in Sanskrit, in the masculine and neuter theme, in ta, in the feminine, in tô, ends, in Old Slavonic, in the masculine-neuter base, in lo, in the feminine, in la; and I consider the l of this participial suffix as a weakening of d; as, in Latin, lacryma, levir, from dacryma, devir (see §. 17.), and, in Lithuanian, lika, “ten,” at the end of compounds, for dika (see §. 319. Rem. p. 449 G. ed.). And I am hence of opinion, that, both with reference to their root and their formation, byl, byla, bylo, “having been” (masculine, feminine, and neuter), may be compared with the Sanskrit words of the same import, bhuita-s, bhuitd, bhuita-m, and Persian bûdah. In Polish, byt means “he was,” byta, “she was,” byko, “it was,” byli, byty, “they were,”* without the addition of an auxiliary verb, or a personal termination: and

[G. Ed. p. 879.] as in general the forms in t, ta, to, ti, ty, do not occur at all as proper participles, but only represent the preterite indicative, they have assumed the complete character of personal terminations.† They resemble, therefore, only with the advantage of the distinction of gender like nouns, the Latin amamini, amabimini, in which words the

* The masculine form bytî belongs only to the masculine persons: to all other substantives of the three genders the feminine form byty belongs.

† And no notice is taken in Grammars, that, according to the gender alluded to, they are the nominatives of a former participle.
language is no longer conscious that they are masculine plural nominatives, (see §.478.). Still more do the above Polish forms resemble the persons of the Sanskrit participial future, which employs for all genders the masculine nominatives of the three numbers of a participle corresponding to the Latin in *turus*; so that *bhavítā, “futurus,”* stands instead of *futurus, a, um, est,* and *bhavítāras, “futuri,”* instead of *futuri, æ, a, sunt.* But *byt, “he was,”* corresponds most exactly to the Persian word of the same meaning, *būd* or *būdah,* “having been,” in the sense of “he was.” In the first person singular masculine, *bytem (by-tem)* answers admirably to the Persian *bādam,* which I render in Sanskrit by *bhūtō ’smi* (euphonic for *bhūtās asmi*) i.e. “the man having been am I.” In the feminine and neuter, the Polish *bytam (byta-m)* corresponds to the Sanskrit *bhūtā ’smi,* “the woman having been am I,” and in the neuter, *bytom, (byto-m)* to the Sanskrit *bhūtam asmi,* “the thing having been am I.” In the second person, in the three genders, the Polish *bytēs (byt-ēś)* corresponds to the Sanskrit masculine *bhūtō-śi* (for *bhūtās asi*); *bytaś (byta-ś),* to the Sanskrit feminine *bhūta ’si; bytos (byto-ś)* to the Sanskrit neuter *bhūtam asi.* In the plural, the masculine *byti-smy,* and feminine *byty-smy,*† [G. Ed. p. 880.] correspond to the Sanskrit feminine and masculine *bhūtās smas;* and so, in the second person, *bytys cie, bytys cie,*† to the Sanskrit *bhūtās stha.*

“Remark 1.—I have no doubt that the syllable *em* of the Polish *by-tem,* and the simple *m* of the feminine *byta-m* and neuter *byto-m,* belong to the verb substantive, which, therefore, in *byta-m, byto-m,* and so in the feminine and neuter second person *byta-ś, byto-ś,* has left merely its

---

* See p. 854, Note *.

† The Polish *c* is like our *z,* and has the same etymological value as *t;* for instance, in the second person plural the termination *cie* corresponds to the Old Slavonic *TE te,* and, in the infinitive, the termination *e* to the Old Slavonic *TH ti.*
personal termination, just as in the German contractions, *im*, *zum*, *am*, *beim*, from *in* *dem*, &c., the article is represented only by its case-termination. In the first and second person plural, however, the radical consonant has remained; so that *šmy*, *ście*, are but little different from the Sanskrit *smas*, *stha*, and Latin *sumus* (for *smus*). But if *šmy*, *ście*, be compared with the form exhibited by the Polish verb substantive in its isolated state, some scruple might, perhaps, arise in assenting to the opinion, that the present of the verb substantive is contained in *byt-em*, 'I (a man) was,' *byti-šmy*, 'we (men) were,' or in *czytat-em*, 'I read,' *czytati-šmy*, 'we read'; for 'I am' is *yestem*, and 'we are,' *yesteš my*. It would, in fact, be a violent mutilation, if we assumed that *byt-em*, *byti-šmy*, have proceeded from *byt-yestem*, *byt-yesteš my*. I do not, however, believe this to be the case, but maintain that *yestem*, 'I am,' *yestesmy*, 'we are,' *yesteš*, 'thou art,' and *yesteš cie*, 'ye are,' have been developed from the third person singular *yest*. For this *yest* answers to its nearest cognates, the Old Sclavonic *yesty*, Russian *esty*, Bohemian *gest* (*j*=*y*), Carniolian *ye* (where the *st* has been lost), as, to the old sister languages, the Sanskrit *asti*, Greek *ērī*, Lithuanian *esti*, and Latin *est*.* But *yestem*, *yestesmy*, &c., do not admit of an organic comparison with the corresponding forms of the languages more or less nearly connected. On the other hand, the last portion of *yesteš my*, 'we are,' answers exactly to the Russian *esmy*; and it must be assumed, that the concluding part of *yest-em*, 'I am;' has lost an *s* before the *m*, just as the *m* of *byt-em*, 'the having been am I.' It cannot be surprising that the superfluous *yest* is not conjointly introduced in the compound with the participle. At the period of the origin of this periphrastic preterite it did not, perhaps, exist in the

* Regarding the initial *y*, see §. 255. *n.*
isolated present, or the language may still have been conscious of the meaning of the *yest of *yest-em, and that the whole properly expressed, 'it is I,' 'c'est moi.' Thus, in Irish-Gaelic, *is me 'I am,' according to O'Reilly, properly means 'it is I,' and *ba me or *budh me is literally 'it was I' (*budh, 'he was,' = Sanskrit *abhât, see §. 573., *ba, 'he was' = *abhavat, §. 522.) and in the future, in my opinion, the character of the third person regularly enters into the first person, and, in the verb substantive, may also grow up with the theme in such a manner that the terminations of the other persons may at ch themselves to it.* Moreover, the Irish *fuilim, 'I am,' *fuir, 'thou art,' *fuil, 'he is,' *fuirmid, 'we are,' &c., deserve especial remark. Here, in my opinion, the third person has again become a theme for the others; but the l of *fuil, 'he is,' appears to me to be a weakening of an original d, like that of the Polish *byt, 'he was': the difference of the two forms is, however, that the l of the Irish form is a personal termination, and that of the Polish a participial suffix; and therefore *byt-em signifies, not 'it was I,' as *fuilim, 'it is I,' but clearly 'the person having been am I.' But from the procedure of the Irish language this objection arises, that the Persian *bud, 'he was,' just like the previously-mentioned Irish *budh, might be identified with the Sanskrit aorist *abhât; and it might be assumed that this third person has been raised into a theme for the rest, and has thus produced *bâdam, 'I was,' *bâdi 'thou wast,' &c., like the Irish *fuilim, 'I am,' *fuir, 'thou art.' But this view of the matter is opposed by the circumstance, that together with *bud the full participial form *budh also exists, which serves, as a guide to the understanding of the former form. If it were wished to regard the d of *burd, 'he bore,' as the

* Biad or beid, "I shall be," biadhair or bheidh, "thou wilt be," beidh, "he will be"; *béim or *béidh-mur or *béidh-mid or *biodh-maoid, "we shall be." See my Treatise "On the Celtic Languages," pp. 44, 46.
sign of the person, the whole would be to be referred to the Sanskrit imperfect abharaṭ. But in very many cases objections arise to the referring of the Persian aorist to the Sanskrit imperfect, or first augmented preterite, since the latter has always a common theme with the present, while, e.g., the Persian kunad, 'he makes,' which is based on the Vedic kriṇāti (from karnāti, with loss of the r), does not answer to the theme of kard, 'he made.' On the other hand, this kard, like the participle kardah, admits very easily of being compared with krīta-s (from karta-s), 'made.' Just so bast, bastah, 'he bound,' bastah, 'bound;' and 'having bound,' does not answer to the present bandad, 'he binds,' but to the Zend passive participle basta, 'bound'; for which the Sanskrit is baddha, euphonic for badh-ta, the dh of which, in Zend and Persian, has become s (see §. 102.)."

"Remark 2.—In Persian there exists, together with am, 'I am,' a verb hastam of the same signification, which exhibits a surprising resemblance to the Polish yestem, as the third person hast does to the Persian yest.* If it were wished to assume that the third person hast is akin to ast, and has arisen from it by prefixing an h, as the y of the Polish yest and Old Sclavonic yesty, is only an inorganic addition (see §. 255. n.), I should then derive the Persian hastam, hasti, &c., also, just as the Polish yestem, yestē, from the third person. With regard to the prefixed h, we may consider as another instance the term used for the number 'Eight,' hasht, contrasted with the forms beginning

* Professor Bopp writes hest, and hestem, and thus renders the resemblance between the Persian and Polish words more striking. So, above, he writes kerd, and even berd; but it is incorrect to express the short vowel ā by e, and to represent ā by e is still more indefensible. It is true that an affected pronunciation of the ā is creeping in, and kard in particular is often pronounced kerd, as oblige, in English, is sometimes pronounced oblige; but this practice is unsanctioned by authority, and to ground etymological affinities upon it would be erroneous.—Translator.
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with a vowel in the kindred languages. It appears to me, however, better to compare hastam with the Zend histāmi, 'I stand' (from sistāmi); as, so early as the Sanskrit, the root of 'to stand' frequently supplies the place of the verb substantive, as also in the Roman languages it aids in completing the conjugation of the old verb. Compare, therefore,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GREEK</th>
<th>ZEND</th>
<th>PERSIAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ἵσταμι,*</td>
<td>histāmi,</td>
<td>hastam.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἵστας,</td>
<td>histahi,</td>
<td>hastā.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἵστατι,</td>
<td>histaiti,</td>
<td>hast.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἵσταμεν,</td>
<td>histāmahi,</td>
<td>hastām.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἵστατε,</td>
<td>histatha,</td>
<td>hastād.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἵσταντι,</td>
<td>histēnti,</td>
<td>hastand.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Observe, that the third person singular hast is devoid of the personal sign; otherwise we should have in its place hastad, according to the analogy of barad, 'he bears,' pursat, 'he asks,' dihad, 'he gives,'† and others. With respect to the suppression of the personal terminations, [G. Ed. p. 883.] the form hast resembles the German werd, hült, for werdet, hältet. Pott's opinion—who, in the derivation of the forms under discussion, has likewise referred to the root of 'to stand' (Etym. Forsch. I. 274.), but prefers recognising in the t of the Polish ystem, as of the Persim hastam, the t of the passive participle—is opposed by the consideration, that neither in Sanskrit has the root as, nor in any other cognate language has the kindred root, produced or contained the

* Sanskrit tisṭṭhatāmi, see §. 508.
† The η of diham, "I give," appears to me a remnant of the Zend aspirated dh of dadhāmi (§. 39.); as I have already traced back elsewhere the η of nihādan, "to place" (present niham), to the Sanskrit dh of dhā, and recognised in the syllable ni an obscured preposition (the Sanskrit ni, "down," Vienna Ann. 1828, B. 42. p. 258). The form diham resembles the Old Slavonic damy for da-dmy (§. 436.) and our preterites like kiefs, hielt (§. 592.) herein, that the reduplicate syllable has gained the semblance of the principal syllable.
participle mentioned. There is, in Sanskrit, no participle asta-s, but for it bhūta-s; in Persian no astah, but būdah; in Sclovonic no yesl, but byl; in Lithuanian no esta-s, in Latin no estus, in Gothic no ists. Hence there is every reason for assuming, that if there ever existed a participle of the other root of 'to be,' analogous to bhūta, 'been,' it must have been lost at so early a period, that it could not have rendered any service to the Polish and Persian in the formation of a preterite and present of the indicative."

629. The Bohemian, in its preterites, places the present of the auxiliary verb after the past participle, and separated from it; the Carniolan prefixes it; and the Russian leaves it entirely out, and distinguishes the persons by the pronouns, which are placed before the participle. "I was," in Bohemian, is, according to the difference of genders, byl sem, byla sem, bylo sem; in Carniolan sim bil, sim bila, sim bilo; in Russian, ya bil, ya byla, ya bylo. But the present of the Carniolan verb substantive is very remarkable, on account of the almost perfect identity of the three persons of the dual, and of the two first of the plural, with the Sanskrit; where, according to a general law of sound, the forms swas, "we two are," stas, "ye two are," reject their final s before vowels (short a excepted), and hereby

[G. Ed. p. 884.] coincide entirely with the Carniolan, in which sva signifies "we two are," sta, "they two are." In Sanskrit swa iha, means "we two are here," sta iha, "they two are here." In the plural, the Carniolan smo answers to the Sanskrit स्वस्त smas (before vowels sma), ste to स्थ stha, so to स्तोत santi. It is, however, to be observed, that both languages have, independently of each other, lost the initial vowel, which belongs to the root, which has remained in the Old Sclovonic with the prefix of a ु, excepting in the third person plural (see §. 480.).

630. If the German auxiliary verb thun is contrasted, as above (§. 621.), with the Sanskrit root dhd, "to place," "to make,"
then preterites like the Gothic *sdkida* and German *suchte* appear, in respect to their composition, like cognate forms to the Greek passive aorists and futures; as, *ἐτύφ-θην, τυφ-θήσομαι*, in which I recognise the aorist and the future middle of *τίθημι* = Sanskrit *dadhami.* The concluding portion of *τυφ-Θῶ, τυφ-θείν, τυφ-θήσομαι*, is completely identical with the simple *Θῶ, θείν, θήσομαι*, in conjugation; and *ἐτύφ-θην* is distinguished from *ἐθην* by this only, and, indeed, advantageously, that it gives the heavier personal terminations of the dual and plural no power of shortening the vowel of the root, as is the case with the Sanskrit अधाम = *θην*, even in its simple state; since, in this language, *adham-ma* answers to the Greek *ἐθε-μεν* for *ἐθημεν*, as the Greek *ἐστην*, also, does not admit of the length of its root being shortened in the dual or plural. Thus the imperative *τύφ-θητι*, also, is distinguished from *θές* by preserving the length of the root, as also by its more full personal termination. From the future *τυφ-θήσομαι* an aorist *ἐτυφθήμην* should be looked for; or, *vice versa*, the future should have been contented with active terminations, as well as the aorist. Perhaps originally *ἐτύφθην* and *τυφ-θήσω* simultaneously existed, and thus also *ἐτυφ-θή-μην* (or *ἐτυφθέμην*) and *τυφ-θήσομαι*, as periphrastic active and passive tenses. In the present state of the language, however, the aorist has lost the passive form, and the future the active; and when the syllable *θη* was no longer recognised as an auxiliary verb, it received the meaning of a passive character; just as the German language no longer perceives an auxiliary verb in the *te* of *suchte*, but only an expression for the past; or as we have ceased to recognise in the *te* of *heute* the word *Tag*, “day,” and in *heu* (Old High German *hīu*) a demonstrative, but regard the whole as a simple adverb formed to express “the present day.”

631. As to the form of the Greek second aorist and future passive, I consider ἐτύπην and τυπήσομαι as abbreviations of ἐτύφθην, τυφθῆσομαι. The loss of the θ resembles, therefore, that of the σ in the active aorists of verbs with liquids (§. 547.): it need not, however, surprise us, that, as the φ of ἐτύφθην, from regard to the θ following, assumes the place of the radical π, after this θ is dropped the original sound again makes its appearance, and therefore ἐτύφην, τυφθῆσομαι, are not used. The case is similar to that of our vowel Rück-Umlaut (restored derivative sound), since we use the form Kraft as corresponding to the Middle High German genitive and dative krefte, because, after the dissolution of the vowel which had generated the Umlaut, the original vowel recurs, while we, in the plural, say Kräfte, like the Middle High German krefte. Various objections oppose the opinion that the verb substantive [G. Ed. p. 886.] is contained in ἐτύπην, much as the appended auxiliary verb agrees in its conjugation with that of γν. But the double expression of past time in ἐτύπην, once in the principal verb and once in the auxiliary, if the verb substantive be contained in it, cannot fail of surprising us; while the Sanskrit, in combining its ḍsam, “I was,” with attributive verbs, withdraws the augment, and, with it, also the radical vowel a of the auxiliary verb (§. 542.). The augment in the future τυπήσομαι, and in the imperative τύπιθι, must appear still more objectionable. Why not τυπέσομαι, τύπισθι, or, perhaps, the σ being dislodged, τύπιθι, and, in the third person, τυπέστω or τυπέτω? The termination εἰς in the participle τυπεῖς has no hold whatever in the conjugation of the verb substantive.

632. The Latin vendo, if we do not refer the auxiliary verb contained in it to do=диδωμι, ὅθαμι dadamī, but to τίθημι, ὁθαμί dadhāmi, must be regarded as a cognate form to the German formations like sōkida, sōkilēdum, “I sought,” “we sought,” and the Greek like ἐτύφθην, τυφθῆσομαι. The Sanskrit ḍā, “to give,” and dḥā, “to place,” are distinguished only by the aspiration of the latter; and in Zend these verbs
are scarce to be distinguished at all from one another, because 
\(d\), according to §. 39., in the inner sound (\(Inlaut\)) frequently 
become \(dh\), while \(dh\) itself lays aside the aspiration in the ini-
tial sound (\(Anlaut\)). In Latin, also, शा \(d\) and जा \(dh\) might 
easily be combined in one form, since that language generally 
presents its \(d\) as answering to the Sanskrit \(dh\) and Greek \(\theta\), 
especially in the inner sound, as \(b\) to the Sanskrit \(bh\). But 
the circumstance that the root जा \(dh\), \(\Theta\)H, has not re-
mained, in Latin, in its simple form, does not prevent us 
from recognising it in the compounds \(credo\), \(perdo\), \(abdo\), 
\(condo\), and \(vendo\), just as in \(pessundo\), \(pes-
sumdo\). The form \(venundo\) answers, in respect to the accusa-
tive form of the primary word, to Sanskrit compounds 
like \(v\)śān-chakāra (§§. 619. 625.).

633. In order to trace out in its full extent the influence 
that the Sanskrit root \(dh\) has obtained in the European cog-
nate languages in the formation of grammatical forms, I must 
further remark, that I believe I may refer to this place also 
the last portion of the future and imperative of the Sclavonic 
verb substantive. In Old Sclavonic \(budd\) means "I will be," 
literally, as it appears to me, "I do be." The first portion 
of this compound answers very well to the Sanskrit root 
\(bh\), and is identical with the Zend \(\z\) \(bh\). As, however, 
the Sclavonic \(d\) regularly answers to the Sanskrit diphthong 
\(\alpha \theta \) (\(= a+u\), see §. 255.f.), so must we in the Sclavonic
bhu recognise the Sanskrit Guna-form bhū. And भु, bhū itself receives Guna in the future, and exhibits here, in combination with the other root of "to be," the form bhav-i-şhyāmī, of which we shall treat hereafter. The second portion of the Old Sclavonic क्री bā-dā (from bā-do-m, see §. 255. g.) corresponds in its conjugation exactly to the present veṣṭā,* thus second person bā-deshi, third, bādeśty; only the e and o of बेजपिय veṣ-e-shi, बेजपिय veṣ-e-ty, बेजपिय veṣ-om, &c., is the class-vowel, or vowel of conjunction, while that of de-shi,

[G. Ed. p. 888.] de-ty, do-m, is the abbreviation of the a of the Sanskrit root dhā; for e and o are the usual representatives, in Old Sclavonic, of the Sanskrit short a (see §. 255. a.). We must here recall attention to the Sanskrit root sthd, the d of which, after being irregularly shortened, is treated as though it were the conjunctive vowel of the first class (§. 508.). Hence, also, in the imperative the Old Sclavonic Ḭ ye of क्रीष्टम bā-dye-m, "let us be" ("let us do be"), क्रीष्टदे bā-dye-te, "be ye," answers to the Sanskrit ṭ of tishthē-ma, "we may stand," tishthē-tu, "ye may stand" (§. 255. e.).

634. There is, in Old Sclavonic and Russian, also a verb which occurs in an isolated state, which signifies "to do," "to make," and which is distinguished from that which is contained in bā-dā only by the circumstance that it exhibits छ dāye instead of डे de as root, which does not prevent me from declaring it to be originally identical with it. Its present is छो dyeyā,† and it is rightly compared by Kopitar with our thun and the English do. From it comes the neuter substantive dyelo, "deed," as "thing done," which, in its formation, answers to the participles mentioned above (§. 628.), and has, in advantageous contrast with them, preserved the

* See §. 507. where, however, in the first person plural, we should read veṣ-o-m instead of veṣ-o-me.

† Analogous with sye-yā, "I sow"; as, in Gothic, ḫō-ths, "deed," and ḫē-ths, "seed," rest on a like formation, and roots which terminate similarly.
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original passive meaning, while they have erroneously been assigned to the active voice.

635. To bûdû, “I shall be,” the Old Slavonic idû, “I go,” which is also placed by Dobrowsky (p. 350) in the same class with bûdû, is analogous. Idû therefore means, literally, “I do go,” and springs from the widely-diffused root i (infinitive i-ti), whence, in Gothic, the anomalous preterite i-ddya, “I went,” plural i-ddyédum, “we” [G. Ed. p. 889.] went.” I believe that these forms have proceeded from i-da, i-dédum, simply by doubling the d and annexing a y; and I take them, therefore, in the sense of “I did go,” “we did go”; and compare with them the Slavonic i-dû as present. The d of shédû, however, which is used in completing the conjugation of idû, I consider as belonging to the root, and look upon the whole as akin to the Sanskrit सद to go, to which belong also choditi, and the Greek ἀδέσ. The forms ωςκάς o-dyeschdû, “I do on,” “I dress,” na-dyesch-dûsya, “I hope,” ζα-dyeschdû, “angario, onus impono,” which Dobrowsky, l.c., likewise compares with bû-dû, remarking that they stand for odyeyû, &c., I consider as reduplicate forms of the root dye, “to make,” mentioned above; for d gladly, and under certain circumstances, regularly assumes the prefix of χsch, for which reason duschdy, “give,” and yaschdy, “eat” (for dady, yady), correspond to the Sanskrit dadŷâs, “thou mayest give,” adŷâs, “thou mayest eat” (see Kopitar’s Glagolita, pp. 53 and 63). The conjecture, however, that o-dyeschdû, na-dyeschdû, ζα-dyeschdû, are reduplicate forms, is strongly supported by the circumstance that the corresponding Sanskrit and Greek verbs also (dadhami, τίθημι) are reduplicated in the special tenses, like dadâmî, δίδωμι; and to the two last forms a reduplicate verb corresponds in Slavonic likewise (see §. 436.).

636. The Lettish possesses some verbs which are combined, throughout their whole conjugation, with the auxiliary verb under discussion. Of this class is dim-deh-t, “to ring,”
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(deht = dé-t), together with dim-t, id. nau-deh-t, “to mew,” with nau-t, id. In bai-deh-t, “to make afraid,” with bē-t, “to fear” (Sanskrit म bhī), fskum-deh-t, “to disturb,” i.e. “to make mournful,” with fskum-t, “to be mournful,” the meaning of the auxiliary verb makes itself clearly perceptible, and [G. Ed. p. 890.] replaces the causal formation. In other cases the appended déh-t may be rendered by thun, “to do,” thus dim-deh-t, “to do ring” (compare Pott, I. 187). Regarding the Lithuanian imperfect of habitude, in which we have recognised the same auxiliary verb, see §. 525.

637. It deserves to be noticed, that, in Zend also, the verb under discussion of “placing,” “making,” “doing,” occurs as an appended auxiliary verb. Thus, yašsh-dī, “to purify,” literally “to do purify,” from which the present middle yašsh-dāštē, “they do purify” (regarding the extended form dath, see p. 112), the preceptive middle pairi yašsh-dāthitha, “they may purify” (Vend. S. p. 266), imperative yašsh-dāthānī, “let me do purify” (l. c. p. 500). The form dātīti of yašsh-dātīti, “the purification” (l. c. pp. 300, 301), corresponds, in radical and derivative suffix, to the above-mentioned Gothic dēths (theme dēdī). For the frequent expression yašsh-dayāvin anhen, “they are purified,” we ought perhaps to read yašshdayāvin anhen, in which case the former might be regarded as the locative of yašshdā, so that the whole would signify “they are in purification.”* But if

* I formerly thought, that in this and similar expressions the root dā, “to give,” was contained (Gramm. Crit. p. 322), which might very well formally be the case, as is also Burnouf’s opinion, who, however, assents, at Yaṣṇa, p. 356, Rem. 217, to Fr. Windischmann’s explanation, who was the first to recognise in this and similar compounds the Sanskrit root dhā instead of dā. To the remark made by Burnouf (l. c. Note E. p. xi.), that the initial sound dh in Zend is not permissible, it may be added, that in the middle also, after a consonant, d is necessarily used for the original dh: hence the Sanskrit imperative termination dhi, which in Zend, after vowels, appears as dhi, is, after a consonant, di: thus daz-dī, “give,” opposed to śrūi-dhi, “hear,” hērēnāi-dhi, “make.”
the reading yadshdayann is correct, then it [G. Ed. p. 891.] may be taken as the accusative plural in the sense of purificatos; so that the verb substantive would be construed as in Arabic with the accusative.

638. We return to the reduplicated preterite, in order to consider its formation in Zend. Examples have been given in §. 520., which, in their principle of formation, correspond, for the most part, with the Sanskrit. Thus, मात्रम् didvaśa answers to the Sankrit didwēśha, “he hated,” with the prefix of an a before the Guna vowel e, according to §. 28. The forms म मात्रम् viviśe and म मात्रम् tūtava shew that the Zend, in departure from the Sanskrit, admits long vowels in the syllable of repetition. Vivēś-e, from the root vēś, “to obey,” is the second person singular middle, and wants the personal sign; thus, e for the Sanskrit sē, and Greek σαυ. Here, from want of adequate examples, we must leave it undecided whether this suppression, which makes the second person the same as the first and third, takes place merely after sibilants, or principally after consonants. The form म मात्रम् tūtava, “he could,” from the root tav,* should be, according to the Sanskrit principle, tatāva, as a radical a, in the third person singular, is necessarily lengthened; but the Zend form above has transferred the long quantity to the syllable of reduplication, and, as it appears, through the influence of the v of the root, has replaced the a sound by ū. On the other hand, the root vach, “to speak,” which, in Sanskrit, in the syllable of repetition suppresses the a, and vocalizes the v to u (uvacha or uvācha), in Zend regularly forms vavacha, which, Vend. S. p. 83., occurs as the first person, and is rendered by Anquetil, “j’ai prononcé.” That the Zend does not par-

* Compare म मात्रम्, गृहि येजि tavahn, “if they can,” Vend. S. pp. 209 and 332, as third person plural of the imperfect subjunctive in the sense of the present.
ticipate in lengthening the a, which, in Sanskrit, before sim-
ple consonants enters at will into the first person singular, and of necessity into the third person, is
proved also by the form ततसा tatas, "he formed" (see Burnouf, Yaṣṇa, p. 104), the root of which is referred by
Burnouf, and with justice, to the Sanskrit तक्ष takṣh, and, as it appears to me, fitly compared with the Greek τάσσω.

639. The passage of the Vend. S. (p. 3), which has fur-
nished us with the form ततसा tatas, (in the litho-
graphed Codex erroneously tolas), supplies us also with two
other reduplicate preterites, which have, too, (and this de-
serves notice,) a perfect meaning, while the corresponding
Sanskrit tense refuses the function of a perfect (§. 513.).
We read l. c. यो यो ततसा यो तथृये, "who has made us,
who has formed (us), who has sustained (us)." The form
dadha, which Neriosengh renders by द्दै dadaũ, "dedit," instead of dadhau,* is, in my opinion, of special
importance, on account of the remarkable manner in which
it coincides in root and formation with the above-men-
tioned (§. 622.) Old Saxon döda, "I did," "he did." The Zend
dadha stands for dadhā from dadḥā-a (§. 618.), the long ō
having been shortened, as commonly happens at the end
of polysyllabic words (§. 137.). It does not admit of doubt
that the first person is likewise dadha; as we have seen
from the above-mentioned नववा vavacha, "I spoke," that
in Zend, as in Sanskrit and German, it is the same as the
third person, i. e. it has no more a personal termination than
the latter. In the second person I conjecture the form
dadhātha (§. 453.).

* The root dā, "to give," might likewise form dadha (§. 39.); but in
the passage above, as everywhere where mention is made of creating,
making, it is clear we must understand the verb corresponding to the
Sanskrit धाता dhā, "to place" (with vi, "to make").
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640. I am unable to quote the Zend perfect [G. Ed. p. 893.]
active in the dual and plural, unless the form अन्हेंटि donhénti, which has been already mentioned elsewhere,* is the plural of अन्हा, "fruit," which latter regularly corresponds to the Sanskrit dśa (§§. 56th. and 56th.), and occurs in the following passage of the Vend. S. (p. 40): अन्हेंटि अधिश अन्हेरूति नैत अन्हा नैत ग्हरेनेम्, "there was neither cold nor heat." We find the form अन्हेंटि l. c. p. 45, where are the words अन्हेंटि अन्हेरूति नैत अन्हेंटि अन्हेरूति नैत ग्हरेनेम् अन्हेंटिन अन्हेंटिन अन्हेंटित अन्हेंटित अन्हेंटित हांमो ताशित यौ कतायो नास्को फ्रान्डो अन्हेंटि अन्हेंटि अन्हेरूति अन्हेंटि अन्हेंटि अन्हेंटि अन्हेंटि अन्हेंटि अन्हेंटि अन्हेंटि अन्हेंटि अन्हेंटि अन्हेंटित हांमो ताशित यौ कतायो नास्को फ्रान्डो अन्हेंटि अन्हेंटि अन्हेंटि अन्हेंटि अन्हेंटि अन्हेंटि अन्हेंटि अन्हेंटि अन्हेंटित हांमो ताशित यौ कतायो नास्को फ्रान्डो अन्हेंटि अन्हेंटि अन्हेंटि अन्हेंटि अन्हेंटि अन्हेंटि अन्हेंटि अन्हेंटि अन्हेंटित हांमो ताशित यौ कतायो नास्को फ्रान्डो अन्हेंटि अन्हेंटि अन्हेंटि अन्हेंटि अन्हेंटि अन्हेंटि अन्हेंटि अन्हेंटि अन्हेंटि अन्हेंटि अन्हेंटि अन्हेंटि अन्हेंटि अ


† Anquetil, who seldom renders all the forms in a sentence according to their real grammatical value, here makes the third person plural the second of the imperative, and changes the assertion into a request, by translating thus: "O Hom, accordez l' excellence et la grandeur à celui qui lit dans la maison les Naks."

‡ See Burnouf's valuable Review of the First Part of this Book, Journal des Savans, 1833, in the separate impression, p. 47. There is an error in it, however, in the remark, that I have represented the form अन्हेंटि donhénti as the imperfect of the verb substantive. I meant the reduplicate preterite or perfect.
into a similar error with the closely-approximating roots अस् as, "to be," and अस् आस्, "to sit," which both exist in Zend, particularly as the form donhênti, taken as the perfect, stands, perhaps, quite isolated in the remains of Zend literature which have been preserved to us, but, as the present, has numerous analogous forms? But if donhênti really belongs to the root अस् आस्, "to sit," still we cannot, in my opinion, take it, with Neriosengh, in this sense, but as a representative of the verb substantive, which, as has been shewn (§. 509. p. 737 G. ed.), in Sanskrit, also, occasionally supplies the place of the verb substantive. Two of the Paris MSS. give, as has been remarked by Burnouf, for donhênti the middle form अस्स an donhare; and if this is the correct reading, it speaks in favor of the root of "to sit"; for this, like the kindred Greek verb (γ(σ)-μαι, ἔτο-ται), is used only in the middle. But if donhênti is the right reading, and belongs, as perfect, to the verb substantive, it is, in respect to its termination, more ancient than the Sanskrit आसस (§. 462.).

641. In the middle we find as the third person plural of the verb substantive the form अस्मन्दन्यादि donhare (Vend. S. p. 222), with which, in regard to termination, the form अस्मन्दन्यादि iririthare, "they are dead," agrees (Vend. S. p. 179). If the reading of the two mutually corroborative forms is correct, we then have the termination are for the Sanskrit ire; and it would be a circumstance of much importance that the Zend should have left the old conjunctive vowel a in its original form, in a position where, in Sanskrit, it has been weakened to i. The final e of the Sanskrit termination is suppressed in Zend; but as r cannot stand (§. 44.) at the end of a word, the addition of an e became necessary, as in vocatives like अस्मन्दन्यादि dätarē, "creator,"

[G. Ed. p. 895.] answering to the Sanskrit धातर dätar. If the e of the forms अस्मन्दन्यादि donhare, अस्मन्दन्यादि iri-
irithare, were an error in writing, for which e ought to
stand, then an i would necessarily stand beside the a of the preceding syllable (§. 41.). But as this is not the case we find some evidence of the correctness of the final ê, at least for the fact, that this form among others is admissible; for beside the ελοκεν donhare which has been mentioned, we find, in another passage of the Vend. S. (p. 45), the form ἐλοκεν donhairi, in which the final i, according to §. 41., has introduced an i also in the syllable preceding. The form donhairi, for which, perhaps, one or two MSS. may read donhare, assures us, however, in like manner, of the proposition, which is of most importance, viz. that the conjunctive vowel is properly an a, and not, as in Sanskrit, an i.

642. The form ἑλοκες irītharē is remarkable, also, with regard to its syllable of reduplication: it springs from the root ἑλος irith,* from which a verb of the fourth class frequently occurs; in “irith,” therefore, ir is the syllable of reduplication, after which the short initial i has been lengthened, in order, as it were, to gain strength for bearing the reduplication (compare the Gothic in §. 589.). In irītharē, however, the countertype of the Greek forms with Attic reduplication is easily recognised. We must not, however, seek for the reason of this lengthening of the vowel of the second syllable of forms like ἐληλυθα, ἐμήμεκα, ὄρωρυχα, in the temporal augment, which I also avoid [G. Ed. p. 806.] doing. For though, by concretion with the augment, an e becomes η, and an o becomes ω, this gives no reason for supposing the augment to exist everywhere where an initial

* Probably a secondary root, with the affix th, as in datâ for dâ (see p. 112). Irith, therefore, might stand for mîrith, the initial m having been lost, and might be connected with the Sanskrit root mṛi (mar), whence, as Burnouf has shewn in his frequently-mentioned Review (p. 87), has arisen the form mērench, “to kill,” with another affix, the noun of agency of which is found in the plural, mērēctårô, “the murderers.”
vowel of a verb is lengthened. I content myself, in forms like ἐληλυθα, with the reduplication; and in the vowel following I find only a phonetic lengthening for the sake of the rhythm, or to support the weight of the syllable of reduplication; as in the Zend, iririth, or as (to keep to Greek) in ἀγωγός, ἀγωγεός, ἀγωγη, in which the ω, as is commonly the case, is only the representative of the long α (§ 4.), and where there is no ground for searching for the augment. On the whole it would be unnatural that the augment, being an element foreign to the root, should interpose itself in the middle of the word between the syllable of reduplication and the proper root; and unless a necessity exists, one must not attribute such a phenomenon to a language.

643. In a passage of the Izeshne (Vend. S. p. 65.), which I understand too little to ground on it, with confidence, any inference, while I am without the light which might perhaps be thrown on it by Neriosengh’s Sanskrit translation, I find the expressions त्रैः त्रैः mainyìl mamanìl. It does not, however, admit of any doubt that mainyì is the nominative dual of the base mainyu, “spirit” (see § 210.); and hence, even without understanding the whole meaning of the passage alluded to, it appears to me in the highest degree probable, that mamanìl is the third person dual of the perfect. Perhaps we ought to read mamanìl, so that, through the influence of the final é, the Sanskrit termination Æl would have become Æl. But if the reading mamanìl is correct, and the form is really a perfect, an original Æ would have been weakened to i. The whole form would, however, in my opinion, be of great importance, because it might furnish ground for the inference, that the contraction of the reduplication,

[G. Ed. p. 897.] in Sanskrit forms like mênâl (from mami-
nâl for mamanâl), did not exist before the Zend became separate from the Sanskrit (compare § 606.).
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THE PLUPERFECT.

644. It has been already remarked (§. 514.), that the Sanskrit possesses no pluperfect, and the substitute it uses for it has been noticed. The Zend, also, is undoubtedly deficient in this tense. In the Zend Avesta, however, no occasion occurs for making use of it, or supplying its place in another way. The Latin pluperfect is easily perceived to be a form compounded of the perfect base with the imperfect of the verb substantive. The only point which can admit of doubt is, whether the whole eram is to be considered as existing in fueram, amaveram, as I have done in my System of Conjugation (p. 93), so that the perfect base, to which the i of fui, fui-sti, &c., belongs, would have lost its vowel; or whether we should assume the loss of the e of eram, and therefore divide thus, fue-ram, amave-ram. Now, contrary to my former opinion, I believe the latter to be the case, and I deduce fueram from fui-ram, through the frequently-mentioned tendency of the i to be corrupted before r to ē, whence, e.g., the conjunctive vowel i of the third conjugation appears in the second person of the passive, as also in the imperfect subjunctive and in the infinitive, as ē (leg-e-ris opposed to leg-i-tur, leg-i-mur). For this reason fue-ram also is opposed to the subjunctive fui-ssem, in which, as r does not follow the i, that letter remains in its original form. It would seem much more difficult to discover a reason why fu-essem should have become fu-issem, than why fui-ram should become fue-ram. In general, in Latin, there exists, without reference to a following r, many an ē which has arisen from an older i: I am not acquainted, [G. Ed. p. 898.] however, with any i used for an older ē, as in general the ē is an inorganic and comparatively more recent vowel, but the i is as old as the language itself: for though i as well as u has very frequently arisen from the weakening of the
most weighty vowel a, still no epoch of the language can be imagined when there existed no vowel but a. If, however, the auxiliary verb in *fue-ram, fui-ssem*, has lost its vowel, it shares in this respect the same fate as the Sanskrit *sam* and Greek *σα* contained in the aorist. Where the verb substantive enters into composition with attributive verbs, sufficient reason exists for its mutilation.

645. As the Greek pluperfect is formed from the base of the perfect, as the imperfect is from that of the present, by prefixing the augment, by which the completion of the action is transferred to past time, we should expect in it the terminations *ov, ες, ε, &c.*; thus, *ἐτέτυφον*, which would come very near the Sanskrit imperfect of the intensive—*atōtōpam*. But whence is the termination *eiv* of *ἐτετύφειν*? Landvoigt and Pott recognise in it the imperfect of the verb substantive, so that *ἐτετύφειν* would stand for *ἐτετύφην*. There would, therefore, be a pleonasm in this form, as *ἐτετυφ* already of itself combines the idea of the imperfect with that of the perfect. If, then, the verb substantive be added, it must serve merely as the copula, and not itself express a relation of time, and it therefore lays aside the augment, as the Sanskrit *ḥasam* in aorists like *ἀχαὶ-σαμ*. But it being premised that the verb substantive is contained in *ἐτετύφειν*, it is not requisite to derive its *ei* from the *ή* of *ἡν*. Advert to the analogy of *eiv* with *eiμι*, which latter would become *eiv*, if its primary personal termination were replaced by the more obtuse secondary one. It may be said that the radical *σ* is

[G. Ed. p. 899.] contained in the *i* of *ei-μι*, which sibilant, having first become, by assimilation, *μ* (Doric *ἐμι*), has then, as often happens to *ν* (as *τίθεις* for *τίθενς*), been vocalized to *i*. The analogy of *eiμι* is followed in the compound form (if *ἐτετύφειν* is really compounded as has been stated) by the dual and plural; thus, *ἐτετύφειμεν* for the more cumbrous *ἐτετύφεσμεν*. Here let the Ionic form *eιμέν* for *ἐμέν* be noticed. In the third person plural *ἐτετύφεσαν* (inorganic
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\( \dot{\epsilon}t\epsilon t\upsilon\phi e\sigma\alpha\nu \) the composition with the auxiliary verb is evident; but this person cannot be adduced as evidence for the composition of the other persons, since in general a kind of privilege is accorded to the third person plural active in respect to the appending of the verb substantive, which also extends to the imperfect and aorist of the conjugation in \( \mu \) (\( \dot{\epsilon}\dot{\iota}\deltao-\sigma\alpha-\nu \), \( \dot{\epsilon}\dot{\iota}-\sigma\alpha-\nu \), opposed to \( \dot{\epsilon}\dot{\iota}\deltao-\mu\epsilon\nu \), \( \dot{\epsilon}\dot{\iota}-\mu\epsilon\nu \)); and in like manner in the Latin perfects (\( \text{fuerunt from fuesunt} \). But if the syllable \( e\iota \) of \( \dot{\epsilon}t\epsilon t\upsilon\phi-ei-\nu \) is identical with the \( e\iota \) of \( ei-\mu \), still I am not shaken by this in my opinion that the \( \kappa \) of \( \lambda\ell\upsilon\kappa\alpha \) and the aspiration of \( \tau\upsilon\phi\alpha \) belong to the consonant of the auxiliary root, and that the \( \kappa \) is an intension of the \( \sigma \), the aspiration a weakening of the \( \kappa \) (§. 569.); that, therefore, in \( \ell\ell\ell\ell\ell\ell\kappa\epsilon\nu \), \( \dot{\epsilon}t\epsilon t\upsilon\phi e\nu \), the verb substantive is twice contained, as is the case in Sanskrit forms like \( ay\dot{\alpha}s\dot{s}i\dot{h}a\nu m \) (§. 570.). I believe, however, that at the time when the forms \( \ell\ell\ell\ell\ell\ell\kappa-ei-\nu \), \( \dot{\epsilon}t\epsilon t\upsilon\phi-ei-\nu \), developed themselves from the to-be-presupposed forms \( \dot{\epsilon}t\tau\upsilon\phi\nu \), \( \ell\ell\ell\ell\ell\ell\kappa\nu \), the remembrance of the origin of the \( \kappa \) and of the aspiration had been long lost, and that these forms were generated by the necessity for restoring the missing verb substantive; just as in Old Saxon the form \( \text{sind-un} \), “they are,”* [G. Ed. p. 900.] may first have arisen, when, in the more simple and likewise employable \( \text{sind} \), the expression of the relation of time and person was no longer perceivable; and hence another personal termination, and, in fact, that of the preterite, was annexed.† The Greek medio-passive has admitted neither the first nor the second annexation of the verb substantive: from \( \ell\ell\ell\ell\ell\ell\kappa-ei-\nu \) we might expect \( \ell\ell\ell\ell\ell\ell\kappa-e\iota\mu\eta\nu \), but \( \ell\ell\ell\ell\ell\ell-\lambda\mu\eta\nu \) has

* At the same time with inorganic transfer to the first and second person, \( \text{wir sind, ihr seid} \).

† With the preterite coincide also the Gothic forms of recent origin, \( siy-u-m \), “we are,” \( siy-u-th \), “ye are”: and \( s-\text{ind} \), “they are” (from \( s-\text{ant} \), is alone a transmission from the period of the unity of language.
arisen directly from the reduplicate root, by prefixing the augment, and descends from a period when the active was not as yet ἐλελύκειν, but probably ἐλέλυν.

THE FUTURE.

646. The Sanskrit has two tenses to express the future, of which one, which is more rarely employed, consists of the combination of a future participle with the present of the verb substantive, the root as; in such a manner, however, that (and this has been already noticed as remarkable) the masculine nominative of the three numbers of the participle has assumed the complete nature of a third person of a verb, and this per se without annexation of the verb substantive, and without regard to the gender of the subject; e.g. दत्त dátá, "daturus," is used in the sense of "he, she, or it will give," and so, too, दतार्थ dátáras, "daturi," in the sense of "they will give." Observe here what has been said above of the Latin amamini instead of amamini, -e, -a, estis (§.478.); and remark also the third person of the Polish and Persian preterite (§.628.). In the other persons the Sanskrit combines the masculine [G. Ed. p. 901.] nominative singular of the participle mentioned with the said person of the present of the auxiliary verb; thus, dátási (from dátá-asi) = daturus, datura, daturum est. I annex the full conjugation of the two active forms of the added example, with the remark, that in the third person no difference can exist between the active and middle, since the participle which is employed makes no distinction between the two forms.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SINGULAR.</th>
<th>DUAL.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACTIVE.</td>
<td>MIDDLE.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dátásmi,</td>
<td>dátáhē.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dátási,</td>
<td>dátáśkē.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dátá,</td>
<td>dátā.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
"Remark.—It is very surprising, that, although the compound nature of this tense is so distinctly evident, none of the grammarians, my predecessors, have remarked it; and the first mention of it that has been made was in my System of Conjugation, where it was noticed, without meeting with any opposition from the strongest opponents of the so-called System of Agglutination. As regards the first person singular middle, it must be remarked, that the root as, in this person, changes its s into h, although in Sanskrit this exchange is to be met with nowhere else, but it occurs frequently in Prākrit, and before m and n regularly takes place in the (Inlaut) middle of a word, where mh, nh, are commonly used by transposition for hm, hn; hence, amhi or mhi (resting on a preceding vowel) "I am" (see Lassen, p. 267, &c., Höfer, p. 77). As the Sanskrit k (=gh not ch) is usually represented in Greek by χ, sometimes also by γ, and even by κ* in dātāhē, therefore, may be found a confirmation of the opinion expressed in §. 569., that the κ of forms like ēḍōka, ṛēḍōka, belongs to the verb substantive as a thickening of a σ."

647. In the third person singular, also, the verb substantive sometimes occurs combined with the participle, as vaktāsti, "he will speak," for vaktā;† on [G. Ed. p. 902.] the other hand, we occasionally find, in the other persons also, the verb substantive omitted, and the person expressed

* Compare ēγω, μέγας, κήρ, καρδία, with aham, mahat, hrid, hridaya.
† See my collection of the Episodes of the Mahā-Bhārata (Draupadi, III. 2.), published under the title of "Diluvium."
by a separate pronoun,* as is done in Russian in the preterite (see §. 629.). Sometimes the participle is separated from the auxiliary verb belonging to it by one or more words; as, *kartā tād asmi tē, “facturus hoc sum tibi”* (Mahâ-Bh.). I do not, however, think that such departures from the usual practice of the language could occur where the subject was not a masculine singular; at least it is probable, if *kartā* referred to a feminine, that *kartri* would be used instead of it. Except in these constructions, however, formations in *tār* (in the weak cases *tri,* §. 144.) very seldom occur as future participles;† but their usual function is that of a noun agent, like the corresponding forms in Greek and Latin in *τηρ, ῥοπ, τόρ;* as, *dorhp, dator, datōr-is,* answer to the Sanskrit *dātār* (*दात्र, nominative dātā,* §. 144.). The Latin, however, as has been already observed (§. 516, p. 752 G. ed.), formed from the shorter form in *tōr* a longer one in *tāru,* and has allotted to this exclusively the functions of the future participle. In Zend, the formations in *tār,* in my opinion, occur only as nouns of agency; as, *dātār,* “creator,” (= Sanskrit *dhatār*) nominative *dāta* (see §. 144. p. 169 G. ed.), accusative *dātārem,* vocative *dātāre* (§. 44.). To this class belong in Slavonic the forma-

---

* Compare l. c. p 114, Sl. 31, *bhavitā ’ntas twam for bhavitāsy antas,* “thou wilt be the end.”

† An example occurs in the Raghu-Vansa, VI. 52, Ed. Stenzler, *nrippan tam . . . vyatyaqād anyavadhār bhavitrī,* “regem illum präteritiit alius uxor futura.”
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examples in tely, see §. 259.* From the Gothic we may here adduce the word *blôs-treis* (theme *blôs-trya*), which is quite isolated in its formation, and is connected with *blôt*, “to honor,” the *t* of which, according to §. 102., has passed into *s* before the *t* of the suffix. With respect to the Sanskrit suffix *târ* (*trî*), it remains to be remarked, that in vowels capable of Guna it requires Guna, and that it is not always united with the root direct, but frequently by a conjunctive vowel *i*; in the latter respect, *jan-i-la, jan-i-tôram*, correspond to the Latin *gen-i-tor, gen-i-tôrem*, while *paktâ, paktôram*, answer to *coctor, coctôrem*.

648. In my Sanskrit Grammar I term the future tense just considered, and which is peculiar to the Sanskrit, the participial future, in accordance with its formation, to distinguish it from that which belongs to the Sanskrit, in common with the Zend, Greek, Lithuanian, and Latin, and which I call the auxiliary future, because, in its character स या *syâ*, I recognise the obsolete future of the root *as*, “to be.” I imagine, therefore, that in *dâ-syati*, “he will give,” only the syllable *ya* expresses the future, but that the *s* is the root of the verb “to be,” with loss of its vowel, which is not surprising, as, even when uncompounded, the *a* of the root *as* is frequently lost (§. 480.). The final part of *dâ-syâmi* resembles very closely the potential *syâm*, “I may be,” which actually exists in isolated use. Compare—

* With regard to the formations in *ary*, mentioned at §. 259., it is requisite to observe, that the preceding *t* does not belong to the suffix under discussion, but to the primary word; गलार्य, “goldsmith” (in Russian, also, *golotary*), comes from *goloto*, “gold,” and *bratary*, “porter,” from *brata*, “door.” Mytâry, “toll-gatherer,” is related in its primary word, which does not appear to occur, with the German *Mauth*: compare the Gothic *môtareis* (theme *môtarya*), “toll-gatherer,” *môta*, “*Mauth, “toll.”
### SINGULAR.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Future</th>
<th>Poten.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>syāmi, syām.</td>
<td>syāvas, syāva.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>syasi, syās.</td>
<td>syathas, syātam.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>syāti, syāt.</td>
<td>syatas, syātam.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PLURAL.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Future</th>
<th>Poten.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>syāmas, syāma.</td>
<td>syāthas, syāta.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>syanti.</td>
<td>syus.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

649. We see that the principal difference of the forms here compared is, that the potential has a long ā pervading it, but the future a short a, which, according to the principle of the class-syllables of the first conjugation (§. 434.), is lengthened before m and v of the first person. And besides this, the future has the full primary terminations, but the potential has the more obtuse secondary endings, with that of us in the third person plural, which occurs occasionally also in the imperfect.

650. The Latin has this great superiority over the Sanskrit, that its ero, eris, &c., has been preserved in isolated use, and in fact retaining the initial vowel of the root, in which respect eris, erit, &c. (from esis, esit, §. 22.), is as advantageously distinguished from syasi, syāti, as es-tis from stha, or as, in Greek, ἐσμές from smas, ἑστὸν from sthas, stas (§. 480.)

651. The i of eris, erit, &c., I have already, in my System of Conjugation, represented (p. 91) as a contraction of the [G. Ed. p. 905.] true future character ya; and I have since been supported in this opinion by the Prâkrit, where, for the Sanskrit sya or syā, we occasionally find hi; for instance, in the first person, himi for syāmi, and in the second person hisi for syasi (Latin eris). Some examples have been already given above (p. 401 Note).* It may be further remarked, that the Sanskrit, also, sometimes abbreviates the syllable ya, as also va and ra, by suppressing the vowel and changing the semi-vowel into its corre-

---

spounding vowel (see p. 780 G. ed.); and moreover (which, in the case before us, is still more important to observe with regard to the formal connection of the future and potential), the syllable yd of the mood just mentioned is contracted in the middle to t, by which sydt, "he may be," becomes, in the middle, sita.

652. The Lithuanian has likewise contracted the future character ya to i in the persons most correctly preserved; thus the simu, site, of dû-si-me, dû-si-te (dabimus, dabitis), correspond to the Latin eri-mus, eri-tis, and the whole word to the Sanskrit dâ-syd-mas, dâ-sya-tha; and in the dual dû-si-wa, dû-si-ta, correspond to the Sanskrit dâ-syd-vas, dâ-sya-thas. But in its simple state si has been no more retained in Lithuanian than sya has in Sanskrit, but the verb substantive, in the future, in the two cognate idioms, combines the two roots of "to be" with one another: hence, in Lithuanian, bú-si-wa, bú-si-ta, bú-si-me, bú-si-te, answering to the Sanskrit bhav-i-syd-vas, bhav-i-sya-thas, bhav-i-syd-mas, bhav-i-sya-tha, which are furnished with Guna and a conjunctive vowel i. Compare, in regard to the combination of the two roots of "to be," the Latin fue-runt, for which a simple fui-nt might be expected; or (which is here more in point) the future perfect, fuero, [G. Ed. p. 906.] which I distribute, not into fue-ero, but into fue-ro for fui-ro (compare §. 644.).

653. In the singular, the Lithuanian has almost entirely lost the future character i, and only the s of the auxiliary verb has remained; at least, I believe that in the second person dû-si, "thou wilt give," the personal termination, which, in the second person singular, terminates in all tenses in i, has more claim to the i than the expression of the future has. In the third person, dû-s stands for all numbers (§. 457.); and to the form bú-s of the verb substantive the word bhus, in Irish, of the same signification, remarkably corresponds, but which is quite isolated (see
O'Reilly's Lex., s.v. bhus). The Sanskrit bhav-i-shyati and Zend bē-syēiti, however, form the medium between the Lithuanian būs and Irish bhus.

654. I regard the u in the first person singular of forms like dā-su, "I will give," as in all first persons singular, as the vocalization of the personal character m (see §§. 436, 438.): in the Latin ero, however, for which erio ought to stand, the second element of the Sanskrit yā of syāmi has been preserved in preference to the first; and in this respect ero has the same relation to syāmi that veho, above mentioned, has to vahāmi (§. 733.). The same is the case with the third person plural, in which erunt for eriunt corresponds to the Sanskrit syanti from asyanti, and in respect to its u for a answers to vehunt=vahunti.

655. To the Latin ero, erunt, from eso, esunt, correspond, exclusive of their middle terminations, the Greek ἐσομαι, ἐσονται, the active of which is lost, as far as its simple use. Ἐσονται from ἐσίονται answers to the Sanskrit -syanti for asyanti, and in the singular ἐσται to the Sanskrit -syatē (≡syātai) from asyatē. The form ἐσται is originally nothing else than the middle of ἐστί; and ἐσε-ται also appears, from the point of view of the Greek, like a present, with the con-

[G. Ed. p. 907.] junctive vowel of the conjugation in ω (λέγ-e-ται). The epic forms with double σ (ἐσομαι, ὀλέσσω) can scarcely have been formed from a consideration of metre, but have been used in the construction of verse only because they were already in existence, and had a grammatical claim to that existence. I derive ἐσομαι, ὀλέσσω, by assimilation, from ἐσόμαι, ὀλέσγω,* as μέσος from μέσης for μέδγος (Sanskrit madhya, Latin medium), and as ἀλλος from ἀλγος=alius, Prākrit aṇṇa, Sanskrit anya. The Prākrit regularly assi-

* The Doric form ἐσόμαι from ἐσίομαι for ἐσόμαι consequently contains the character of the future doubled (§. 656.); which cannot be surprising, as, when these words were produced, the reason of the duplication of the σ was no longer perceived by the language.
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milates, as has been already remarked (§. 300, p. 414 G. ed.), the weaker consonant to the stronger, whether this precedes or follows it; and according to this principle it produces also futures in ssan,* ssasi, sadi, &c.; e.g. karissadi, answering to the Sanskrit karishyati, "he will make." Forms of this kind, which are the countertypes of the Greek ἔσσομαι, are in far more frequent use than those above mentioned in himi.

656. In composition the Greek loses the radical vowel of the auxiliary verb; hence, δῶ-σω, δῶ-σομεν, δεῖκ-σω, δεῖκ-σομεν, as in Sanskrit dā-syāmi, dā-syāmas, dēk-ṣyāmi (§. 21.), dēk-ṣyāmas, only with the loss of the y, for which i might be expected, and which, too, it is very remarkable, has remained in some Doric forms, which Koen compares at Greg. Cor. p. 230. They are the following: πραξίουμεν, χαριξίουμεθα, συνιασφυλαξίουμεθα, βοαθησίω, προλεψίω.† To this class belong the common Doric futures in σω, [G. Ed. p. 908.] σοῦμεν, from σέω, σέομεν, for σίω, σίομεν, since the i has been first corrupted to e, and then contracted with the following vowel, as in the declension of bases in ι, as πόλεις proceeded from πόλες, πόλεας, and these from πόλεις, πόλιας; as to the Old High German genitives like bulge-s (palkes) the Gothic like balgi-s correspond, or as, in the feminine i bases, the Old High German form krefti precedes the Middle High German genitives and datives like kreftle. In the genitive plural we have, in Old High German even, according to the difference of authorities, together with kreftio, which must originally have been kreftīo, the form krefteo, and, suppressing the e or i, krefte (chrefte). These genitives, therefore, in their gradual process of corruption, coincide exactly with that of the Greek future; for from yo we arrive first at

* The first person, in this formation, loses the i of the termination, which the forms in himi have retained.

† I agree with Pott (I. p. 115) in thinking βοαθησίω and προλεψίω should be written for βοβησίω, προλεψίω: as the form in ο has arisen first by contraction from εω for ω, the i would be twice represented in ο.
io, thence at eo, and in the farthest corruption at o; just as from the Sanskrit future in syāmi, syāmas, in Greek at first we come to σῶ, σῶμεν; thence to σέω, σέομεν, which we must suppose to have existed before σῶ, σῳμεν; finally to the common future forms like δῶ-σω, δείκ-σω, in which the semi-vowel of the Sanskrit da-syāmi, dék-ṣhyāmi, has entirely disappeared. In the Greek second future, however, the second element of the Sanskrit sya has been retained in preference to the sibilant; and as the liquids have expelled the σ of the first aorist, and ἐστείλα is said for ἐστελσα, so also στελω comes from στελέω for στελώ, and this from στελσιω, according to the analogy of the above-mentioned βασθη-σίω, προλεπ-σίω.

657. It is not probable that the Sanskrit future-character ya should have originally occurred only in the root as of the [G. Ed. p. 909.] verb substantive; but I have scarce any doubt that, at a very early epoch, extending back beyond the period of the separation of languages, the attributive verbs likewise might form their future by annexing directly the syllable ya; that therefore forms like da-yati have existed before or contemporaneously with such as da-syati = δῶ-σει, 'he will give." In the present state of the language, however, the attributive verbs always require the verb substantive in order to denote the future, as the Slavonic languages also apply the newly-constructed future of the verb substantive (§. 633.) to paraphrase the future of the attributive verbs, without, however (the Servian language excepted), forming with it a compound. The Carniolan and Polish employ with the future of the auxiliary verb that participle in l, la, lo, which we have seen above used to express the past (§. 628. &c.): the Russian, however, and Bohemian, and sometimes, also, the Old Slavonic, use the infinitive. Thus, in Carniolan we find, in the various genders, böm,*

* The more complete form of böm is bodem, "I do be," after the analogy
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igřâl, bôm igřâla, bôm igřâlo, “I will play,” literally, “I will be he that plays,” “she that plays,” “it that plays.” In Polish, bedę* czытаł, czytała, czytało, means “I will read,” (“I will be reading”); in Russian, читаю [G. Ed. p. 910.] двигать бду двигать, “I will move,” literally, “I will be moving”; so, in Bohemian, budu kрасти (from kради), “I will steal.” The Servian, however, has this advantage over the other Sclavonic dialects, that it does not require a periphrasis of the future by the verb substantive, but combines the auxiliary verb signifying “to do” with the themes of the attributive verbs, just as with that of the verb substantive: thus, igradyu means “I will play,” as bidyu does “I will be.”

658. Several Sclavonic languages may or must, under certain circumstances, express the future by a preposition prefixed to the present, which signifies “after,” and is pronounced po. We refer the reader to Dobrowsky’s Bohemian Instructions, pp. 160, &c., respecting the difference in signification of the Bohemian futures which are expressed with po, from those which are conveyed by a periphrasis, where both together are used, as po-kradu and budu kрасти. In Carniolan there are not more than ten verbs which express the future by prefixing po; as po-rèzhem, “I will say.”

analogy of the Old Sclavonic бу-дû (§ 633.). The contraction of бóдем to бóм is like that of glèday, “behold” (glèdam, “I behold”), to glèy (see Kopitar’s Cr. Gr. p. 334). The contracted form бóм resembles fortuitously, but in a surprising degree, the Prâkrit present hómi, “I am,” an abbreviation of bhómi, and contraction of the Sanskrit bhavâmi. In the kindred languages, however, a historical fact lies for the most part at the bottom of fortuitous coincidences, which, in the case before us, consists in this, that бóм and hómi, like our bin, Old High German bim, have the same root and the same personal termination.

* Bedę—bendeh, from ďendem, § 255. g.

† Compare the Old Sclavonic reků, recheshi, and Sanskrit vach (see p. 649 G. ed. Note 6.)
The rest all express movement, as pobeshim "I will fly," poytsdim, "I will ride" (Kopitar, p. 332). The Old Sclavonic employs other prepositions besides po, in order to give a future meaning to the present. After po the most in use are oy (ду), "by," and вь дь (н), "upwards"; as dü vidit, "videbit," dü boyd-sya, "timebo" (Sanskrit bhī, "to fear," bhaya, "fear"), vο' rastu, "crescam" (Dobr. p. 377).

659. The periphrasis by būddu, "I will be," is rare in Old Sclavonic: on the other hand, imam, "I have," frequently occurs in the translation of the Gospels as a future auxiliary [G. Ed. p. 911.] verb in combination with the infinitive; as imyeti imashi, "habebis" ("thou hast to have"); priiti imaty syn, "veniet filius"; ne imaty byti, "non erit; ne imaty piti, "non bibet" (Dobrowsky, p. 379). Observe the coincidence of idea with the Roman languages, the future of which, though it has completely the character of a simple inflexion form, is nothing else than the combination of the infinitive with the present of the auxiliary verb "to have." This would perhaps have been with difficulty discovered, or not at all, on account of the contraction which the auxiliary verb experiences in the plural, but for the clear indication of it we receive from the language of Provence, which at times separates the auxiliary verb from the infinitive by a pronoun; as, dar vos n'ai, "je vous en donnerai"; dir vos ai, "je vous dirai"; dir vos em, "nous vous dirons"; gitar m'etz, "vous me jeterez." It is remarkable that the Old Sclavonic occasionally paraphrases the future of the verb "to have" itself by "to have," which the Roman languages are always compelled to do, because they possess no other means of expressing the future: thus the French tu auras (from avoiras) corresponds to the above-mentioned Sclavonic imyat imashi.

660. The Gothic, also, sometimes paraphrases the future by the auxiliary verb "to have"; thus, 2 Cor. xi. 12, tawyan haba for позω; John xii. 26, visaν habaiθ for ἐσται (see Grimm. IV. 93.). The German languages have, that is to
say, like their Sclavonic cognate idioms, from the earliest antiquity lost their primitive future inflexion, which the Lithuanian and Lettish share to this day with the Sanskrit and Greek. As, however, the Sanskrit future *syāmi* is almost identical with the potential *syām*, "I may be," and the future character या springs from the same source with the potential या, it deserves notice that Ulfilas frequently expresses the Greek future by the Gothic subjunctive present, which is in form identical with the Sanskrit potential and [G. Ed. p. 912.] Greek optative. Examples are, Mark ix. 19, *siyau* and *thulau* for ऐ*σομαι* and अνέ*ξομαι*; Mark ix. 35, *siyai* for *έσται*; x. 7, *bileithai* for καταλείψει; x. 8, *siyaina* for *έσοναι*. In the reverse case the Persian uses the only ancient future that it has preserved, viz. پاشم *bdsham* ( = Sanskrit *bhavishyāmi*) also in the sense of the present subjunctive. The attributive verbs in Persian, to denote the future, prefix to the present a particle beginning with *b*, which, with regard to its vowel, is guided by that of the initial syllable of the verb; so that for *u* (*dhamma*) the prefix also contains an *u*, but for other vowels an *i,* as *bi-baram*, "I will carry," *bi-bdżum*, "I will play," but *bu-pursam*, "I will ask." These futures stand in an external analogy with those of the Sclavonic languages, which are formed from the present by prefixing the preposition *po* (§§. 658. &c.). We must, however, leave it undecided whether the Persian prefix of the future, which may also precede the imperative, is identical with the inseparable preposition *bi*, or whether, as appears to me far more probable, it is connected with پاید *bāyad*, "*opertet,*" and has, therefore, an ideal relationship with the periphrasis of the future, which is formed by the auxiliary verb *sollen*, and which still

*Kesra*, properly *i*, which, however, like *fatha*, i.e. original *a*, is usually pronounced *e.*—With regard to this remark of Professor Bopp’s, see my note p. 858. The use of the vowel *dhamma*, with the prep. *d* is at least doubtful: see Lumsden’s Persian Grammar, Vol. 2. p. 396. However, with imperatives the first vowel of which is *dhamma*, it may be admissible.—**Translator.**
remains in several older and more recent German dialects (Grimm IV. 179. &c.). If this is the case, it may be here further remarked, that, in Zend, the imperative is occasionally used in the sense of the future. Thus we read in V. S. p. 82, \( \text{hi urvānem vahistēm ahūm frahārayēṇē,} \) "whose soul I will make to go to the best world." Anquetil translates, "je ferai aller librement son âme aux demeures célestes."*

661. We return to the Gothic, in order to remark that it employs most commonly the present indicative instead of the future, in which it is deficient, as is the case also in Old High German very frequently. The periphrasis, however, begins gradually by sollen and wollen, the latter only in the first person: that by means of werden is peculiar to the New German; in a certain degree, however, the Gothic paves the way for it, as in this language wairtha sometimes occurs in the sense of the future of the verb substantive. Grimm (IV. 177. 178.) quotes the following passages: Matt. viii. 12. Luke i. 14. 2 Cor. xi. 15, where ēṣta is rendered by vairthith; moreover, 2 Cor. vi. 16. where vairtha, vairthand, answer to the Greek ἔσομαι, ἔσονται. In fact, werden, "to become," is the most natural and surest expression of future being, and far better adapted to represent it than the auxiliary verbs wollen, "to will," and sollen, "to owe"; for he who is becoming will certainly arrive at being, and is one who will be hereafter; the willing and the owing, however, may be incapable or be prevented from doing what he would or ought. The

---

*Librement* is clearly the translation of the preposition contained in frahārayēṇē, as Anquetil also, in the page preceding, renders frauābcim (thus I read it for frauācim) by "je parle clairement;" while in both expressions, and especially very often in Zend, as in Sanskrit, the prepositions have no perceptible meaning, which admits of translation, though the Indian Scholiasts also, in the derivation of verbs compounded with prepositions, lay too much stress on the prepositions. We will treat hereafter of the middle imperative termination in nē. As causal form the verb under discussion corresponds to the Sanskrit pra-sārayāmi.
willing person may also alter his will, and hence not do what he intended. The Old Northern language, [G.Ed. p. 914.] in paraphrasing the future, uses the anomalous \textit{mun}, "I think," which employs the preterite form as the present; \textit{e.g. mun} \textit{vera, "eris,} \textit{mun} \textit{slitna, "rumpetur," koma munu, "venient." } To this head belongs the circumstance, that occasion-ally the Gothic weak verb \textit{munan} represents, not, indeed, the proper future, but the Greek construction with \textit{μέλλω}, for which, however, \textit{haban} is also applied (Grimm, IV. 93. 178.); thus John xiv. 22, \textit{munais} \textit{gabairthyan, "μέλλεις ἐμφανίζειν." } Ulfilas, however, could scarcely have imagined that his \textit{munan} and the Greek \textit{μέλλω} are radically akin, which is the case if I mistake not. I believe that \textit{μέλλω} stands in the same re-lation to the Sanskrit \textit{manyē} (only that the latter is a middle verb), "I think," "I mean," as \textit{ἄλλος} does to \textit{anya-s, "the other" (§. 655.). } The circumstance that we have the Sanskrit root, in Greek also, in a truer form, and one which retains the original \textit{n} (\textit{e.g. μένος=manas}), does not prevent the assumption that besides this the favorite exchange of liquids takes place, and consequently \textit{μέλλω} might become estranged from the forms with \textit{n}. 

662. Latin futures like \textit{amabo, docebo}, have already, in my System of Conjugation, as compounds with the root \textit{fu} (the \textit{f} of which in the interior of a word becomes \textit{b}, see §. 18.), and \textit{bo, bis, bit, &c.}, been compared with the Anglo-Saxon \textit{beo, "I will be," bys, "thou wilt be," bydh, "he will be." } \textit{Bo}, a sister form of the \textit{bam} of \textit{amabam, docebam}, discussed before (§§. 526. &c.), answers in conjugation exactly to \textit{ero; bo, therefore, stands for \textit{bio, bunt} for \textit{biunt}, and the \textit{i} of \textit{bis, bit, bimus, bitis, is a contraction of the Sanskrit future character \textit{ya} (§. 651.). } From the root \textit{bhā}, in Sanskrit, would come the forms \textit{bhāyāmi, bhāyasi, bhāyati, &c.}, or with Guna, \textit{bhāyámi, bhāyasi, &c.}, if the said root were not combined in the future with the root \textit{as}, but annexed the syllable \textit{ya} direct (before
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[G. Ed. p. 915.] *m* and *v, yā*). To this would correspond in Latin, in its isolated state, *fujo, fuis, fuit*, in which, however, *fuit* would be distinguished from the perfect (aorist) *fuit* in this, that the *i* in the latter form is nothing but a conjunctive vowel and the weakening of an original *a*, but in the future the contraction of *ya* and expression of the relation of time. In *bo, bis, bit*, the *u* of the root *fu* is passed over, as in *fio, fis, fit*, which is properly the passive of *fu*, and corresponds to the Sanskrit passive *bhū-yē, bhū-ya-sē, bhū-ya-tē*, only with active terminations like the Prākrit, which preserves the characteristic syllable *ya* of the Sanskrit passive (of which we will speak hereafter), but has replaced the middle terminations by active ones.

663. The question may be raised, whether the Latin *bo* is really based on a presupposed Sanskrit *bhūyāmi* or *bhūyāmi*; and thus, whether this form existed at the time of the division of languages, and if alone, or, together with that, compounded with the other root of "to be," on which the Zend *būsyēmi*, the Greek *φῦ-σω*, the Lithuanian *bū-su*, and the Irish *bhus*, "erit," mentioned above, are founded; or whether the Latin *bo* likewise, at an earlier period, was combined with the other auxiliary verb; whether, therefore, in an isolated state, a *furo* from an earlier *fusio*, for *fusio*, existed, like the Greek *φῦ-σω* from *φῦ-σίω*? This question cannot be decided with certainty; but the latter, according to which *amabo, amabis, &c.*, would appear as contractions of *amaburo, amaburis*, appears to me the more probable, particularly as the forms, which are incumbered by the composition, have most cause to be weakened. It may be observed, that, even without any external occasion for being weakened, the Old High German, in the very same root, contrasts with its plural *birumēs*, "we are" (=Sanskrit *bhavāmas, §. 20.*), a singular *bim* for *birum*. The Carniolan *exhibits, as we have seen (§. 657.), together with *bōdem, "I will be" ("do be"), cor-
responding to the Sclavonic cognate idioms, [G. Ed. p. 916.]
a contracted form bôm, to which the Latin bo accidentally
approaches very closely, though with a different kind of
contraction. The Anglo-Saxon beo, mentioned above (also
beom), "I will be," is properly not a formal future, but a
present, answering to the German bin, Old High German
bim, and to the Sanskrit bhavāmi, which is principally used
with a future meaning, while eom=asmi, Gothic im, re-
 mains devoted to the present. It might, also, be disputed
whether the Latin bo of amabo is actually a future, for then
it would be necessary to identify the i of bis, bit, &c., with
the conjunctive vowel a of the Sanskrit bhav-a-si, bhav-a-ti,
and to place it on the same footing with the i of veh-i-s,
veh-i-t=vaḥ-a-si, vaḥ-a-ti (see §. 507.). Remark the obsolete
subjunctive fuan, which presupposes a present indicative fuo,
fuis (§. 510.). However, that opinion appears to be most
probably the true one, that bo, bis, rest on the same prin-
ciple of formation with ero, eris, and that, therefore, there
is a reason why amabo, monebo, have a future and not a
present signification. It appears certain, that the third
and fourth conjugations, did all form their futures ori-
ginally in bo (compare §. 529.); futures in am, however,
are, according to their origin, of the subjunctive mood,*
and we shall return to them hereafter. We have already
(§. 526.) noticed the remarkable coincidence which exists
between the Latin and the Irish, in the circumstance that
the latter combines all attributive verbs in the future with
the labial root of the verb substantive. The Irish, however,
is superior to the Latin in this, that, in the simple state of
the verb substantive, it forms the future not from the
root, which is, in Sanskrit, as, but from that [G. Ed. p. 917.]
which has the labial initial sound (see §. 526. p. 767 G. ed.).

* Compare System of Conjugation, p. 98.
664. It remains to be remarked with regard to the Sanskrit future, that the syllable _sya_, which proceeds from the verb substantive, is combined with the root either directly or by means of a conjunctive vowel _i_, after the manner of the third aorist formation (§. 560.), so that the _s_, through the influence of this _i_, again becomes _sh_; as in _tan-i-śhyāmi_, "extendam." Radical vowels, capable of Guna, receive it;* hence, _dēk-śhyāmi_=ēêk-śω from _diś_, "to shew"; _lēk-śhyāmi_=ēêk-śω from _lih_, "to lick"; _yōk-śhyāmi_=ēêk-śω from _yuj_, "to combine" (§. 19.); _bhav-i-śhyāmi_ from _bhā_, "to be." The Greek has Guna only where the present, also, has a Guna vowel, as in the examples adduced; it contrasts, however, _λω-śω_, _φυ-śω_, _πί-śω_, with the Sanskrit _lav-i-śhyāmi_ from _lā_, "to cut off," _bhav-i-śhyāmi_ from _bhā_, "to be," _kshēp-syāmi_ from _kshēp_, "to throw." The Zend, also, in respect to the Guna, does not agree exactly with the Sanskrit; hence, _e.g._, _būsyēmi_, "ero" (§. 665.), both in not employing the Guna, and also in the direct annexation of the auxiliary verb, corresponds more to the Greek _φυ-śω_ and Lithuanian _bū-su_ than to the Sanskrit _bhav-i-śhyāmi_. We subjoin the full conjugation of this future, and append to it the Latin _fac-so_, which is very isolated, and which agrees with _φυ-śω_, _bū-su_, not only in the formation, but is also radically akin to it (§. 19.).

**SINGULAR.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SANSKRIT.</th>
<th>ZEND.†</th>
<th>LITH.</th>
<th>LATIN.</th>
<th>GREEK.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>bhav-i-śhyāmi</em>, <em>bū-syēmi</em>;</td>
<td><em>bū-su</em></td>
<td><em>fac-so</em>, <em>φυ-śω</em>;²</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>bhav-i-śhyasi</em>, <em>bū-syēli</em>;</td>
<td><em>bū-si</em>;³</td>
<td><em>fac-sis</em>, <em>φυ-σεις</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>bhav-i-śhyati</em>, <em>bū-syēlit</em>;¹</td>
<td><em>bu-s</em></td>
<td><em>fac-sil</em>, <em>φυ-σει</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Where Guna is prescribed in Sanskrit Grammar we are to understand that in the middle of roots only short vowels receive Guna before simple consonants, but at the end of roots long vowels also.

† Zend forms of the 1st per. sing, like the theoretically-formed _būsyēmi_ are not quotable; cf. § 731. Remark.
FORMATION OF TENSES. 893

DUAL.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>bhav-i-śyāvas,</td>
<td>ḽu-siwa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bhav-i-śyathas, bū-śyathā?</td>
<td>bū-sita,</td>
<td></td>
<td>φῦ-σετων.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bhav-i-śyātas, bū-śyathā</td>
<td>like Sing.</td>
<td></td>
<td>φῦ-σετων.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PLURAL.

bhav-i-śyāmas, bū-śyāmahi, bū-sime, fac-simus, φῦ-σομεν.
bhav-i-śyatha, bū-śyatha, bū-site, fac-silis, φῦ-σετε.
bhav- śyānti, bū-śyānti, like Sing. fuc-sunt, φῦ-σοντι.

1 § 42. 2 From φυσίω, § 656. 3 The i is the personal termination: see § 418.

On account of the perfect agreement between तस्यांमि dd-śyāmi, dāśω, and the Lithuanian ďūsu (duo-su), this future, also, may be here fully conjugated, and the Latin dabo subjoined, as it agrees with the Lithuanian i and Sanskrit ya, though not in the auxiliary verb, still in respect to the future characteristic i of dabis, &c.

ACTIVE.

SINGULAR.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sanskrit</th>
<th>Greek.</th>
<th>Lithuanian.</th>
<th>Latin.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>dd-śyāmi</td>
<td>dā-śω,</td>
<td>dūsu,</td>
<td>da-bo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dd-śyasi</td>
<td>dā-śeis,</td>
<td>dū-si,</td>
<td>da-bis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dd-śyati</td>
<td>dā-śeit,</td>
<td>dū-s,</td>
<td>da-bit.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DUAL.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>dd-śyāvas,</th>
<th>dd-siwa</th>
<th>dd-siwa,</th>
<th>da-bimus.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>dd-śyathas,</td>
<td>dā-śeitov,</td>
<td>dū-sita,</td>
<td>da-bitis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dd-śyatas,</td>
<td>dā-śeitov,</td>
<td>like Sing.,</td>
<td>da-bunt.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PLURAL.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>da-syāmas,</th>
<th>dā-śoμεν,</th>
<th>dū-sime,</th>
<th>da-bimus.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>da-syatha,</td>
<td>dā-śeτε,</td>
<td>dū-site,</td>
<td>da-bitis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>da-syanti,</td>
<td>dā-śοντι,</td>
<td>like Sing.</td>
<td>da-bunt.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
894 THE FUTURE.

MIDDLE.

SINGULAR. DUAL.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>dā-syē,</td>
<td>ḍō-σομα.</td>
<td>dā-syāvahē,</td>
<td>ḍō-σομεθον.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dā-syatē,</td>
<td>ḍō-σετα.</td>
<td>dā-syēlē,</td>
<td>ḍō-σεσθον.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MIDDLE.

PLURAL.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sanskrit.</th>
<th>Greek.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>dā-syāmahē,</td>
<td>ḍō-σομεθα.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dā-syadhwe,</td>
<td>ḍō-σεσθε.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dā-syantē,</td>
<td>ḍō-σοντα.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

665. The Zend future agrees, in essentials, with the Sanskrit, as we have already seen from the relation of būsyēmi* to bhavishyāmi. Still this example shews that the Zend, in respect to the Guna and introduction of a conjunctive vowel i, does not everywhere keep pace with the Sanskrit, and in the case before us resembles more closely the Greek φύσω and Lithuanian būsu than भविष्यामि bhavishyāmi. I cannot, however, adduce the form būsyēmi even from the Zend-Avesta, but from the frequently-occurring participle būsyantēm, "the about to be" (Vend. S. p. 89), we may, with as much certainty, infer būsyēmi, būsyēhi, &c., than we can, in Greek, ἐσομα from ἐσομενος, and, in Sanskrit, bhavishyāmi

[G. Ed. p. 920.] from bhavishyan. The form in ēmi, ēti, ētī, is apparent from §. 42.; for the y invariably exerts an assimilating influence upon the ā or a, which precedes the terminations mi, hi, ti, through which those vowels become ē. That, however, the y of the future makes no exception to this rule is proved, if proof be required, among other proofs, by that of वइस्येवत् vacsyētī (Vend. S. p. 83),

* Cf. §. 731. Remark.
"he will say," * answering to the Sanskrit vakṣhyati from vach. In the dual and plural, the y abstains from its assimilating influence, and, in the third person plural, as generally before n, it protects the a following from being weakened to ē, as occurs elsewhere.

666. The third person dual would give the vācasyātō, mentioned at §. 464. p. 646, Note if it corresponded to the Sanskrit vakṣhyatas, from vah, "to carry," "to bear." I now, however, prefer regarding it as the causal of the Sanskrit root vakṣh, "accumulare," which may perhaps also signify "to grow," and to which the Gothic root VAHS regularly answers; whence, vahsya, "I grow," vōhs, "I grew," with h for k, according to a general law for the change of sounds. The Zend ucsyēmi, "I grow," appears to be a contraction of vacsyēmi (compare p. 780 G. ed.), as, in Sanskrit, such contractions occur only in forms devoid of Guna; and, e.g., from vach, "to speak," the gerund, indeed, is uktwē, but the infinitive, which requires Guna, is not uktum, but vaktum. As, then, in the causal verb the vowels capable of Guna receive it, it need not surprise us if, in Zend, the root vaecs, as a verb of the fourth class, to which Guna does not belong, were contracted to uss, but, in the causal, retained the full form vace, as, in Sanskrit, the root vyadh of the fourth class forms, in the present, vidhyāmi for vyadhyāmi, but, in the causal, vyādhayāmi.

667. That the Zend, also, occasionally [G. Ed. p. 921.] uses the conjunctive vowel i in its future is proved by the form daibisyānti, "they will disturb," from the root dab, which corresponds to the Sanskrit dambh, "to deceive," and in the preceding and several other forms, which occur in the Vend. S., has, through the influence of the i of

* Anquetil (p. 139), "voici ce que dit maintenant."
the following syllable, received an i in the root (§. 41.). It is translated by Anquetil in various passages by *affligier* and *blessier*. The future form mentioned occurs in the V. S., p. 215, यौि वै० *daibisyanti,* "which will disturb you both." Anquetil renders this strangely enough "vous deux, affligez ceux qui me tiennent dans l'oppression." In another passage (p. 223) we find the third person plural of the future middle of the same verb, viz. *daibisyantè,* which Anquetil likewise regards as the second person imperative, and renders by *blessez.*

668. In the Zend future forms hitherto considered, the sibilant of the verb substantive appears in the form of a ा s, because it follows letters which, in Sanskrit, according to §. 21., require the change of the s into sh, for which, in Zend, ा s or ा sh is regularly written. After such letters, however, as, in Sanskrit, leave the s unaltered, an h must be expected in the Zend future, according to §. 53., instead of the sibilant; and this we find, also, in the passive participle *zanhyamana,* "the man about to be born" (Vend. S., p. 28), from which we may safely infer an indicative *zanhyè,* "I shall be born." Anquetil, indeed, renders the words ा सक्षम्यनण्मच्या बानायमनण्मच्या *zanhyamana* as "and of the persons born and about to be born,"† by "les hommes qui naissent et engendrent," according to which *zanhyamana* must be considered as a middle present participle; but it is impossible that the root *zan,* = Sanskrit *जन, jan,* can arrive at an h without thereby expressing the future. At most we might be in doubt, whether *zanhyamana* should be regarded as of the middle or of the passive voice, as these voices in the general tenses, as also in the special

* I believe it is to be written thus, instead of —क्ष.
† Compare Burnouf’s Yaṣṇa, Note O., p. 71.
tenses of the fourth class, are not distinguished from each other. The Indian grammarians take *jāyē*, "I am born," as a middle, so that *ya* passes as the characteristic of the fourth class (see §. 109*. 2.); but as the passive, also, in the special tenses, annexes the syllable *ya* and may reject the *n* in the root *jan*, by which the *a* is lengthened, so there is nothing to prevent us from regarding the verb *jāyē*, also, as a formal passive on account of its passive meaning. Thus I consider the Zend participle *zāihyamana* as passive.

669. From the roots *dā*, "to give," and *ddā*, "to place," the future form *ddōnhyēmi* might, according to §. 56 b., be expected: as, however, in Zend, *khy* also sometimes occurs as the representative of the Sanskrit *sy* (see p. 280), we must be prepared for a form *ddākhyēmi*; and the [G.Ed. p. 923.] passive participle of this we find in Vend. S., p. 89, where, in like manner, the passive past participle, *uz-dālanaim*, "of those held up," precedes the genitive plural of the future participle *uzddākhyamnanaim* (=Sanskrit *uddḥāsyāmāṇānām*), "of those about to be held up,"* as above we have seen *zālanaim-cha* and *zāihyamananaim-cha* close together. As we have, therefore, the sibilant of the verb substantive here before us in the shape of a guttural, we will again draw attention to what has been said above of the probable origin of the *κ* of *ēθωκα, déθωκα*, from *σ* (§§. 568. &c.). As the Zend root *dā*, "to place," "to lay," "to make,"† corresponds to the Greek *ταθημ*, consequently the *dākh* of the *dākhyamanaim*, which has been mentioned, would be identical with the Greek *θηκ* of *ēθηκα, τέθηκα*.

670. As respects, however, the origin of the exponent of

---

* With a perhaps erroneous rejection of the *a* of the participial suffix. Anquetil's translation, also, "qu'il faut toujours tenir élevés," is evidence that this may be regarded as expressing the future. Cf. Burnouf l. c. Note Q., p. 86.

† The corresponding Sanskrit *dhd* means also "to hold."
the future, *ya*, with which that of the potential and precative *
* is to be ranked, I am still of the opinion already expressed in my System of Conjugation, that these syllables proceed from the root § 7, "to wish." Consequently the Greek optative, which is founded on the Sanskrit potential and precative, would, according to its signification, have its name from the same verb to which it owes its formal origin. If the conjunctive vowel of the first and sixth class be added to the root § 7, it would make *ya*, according to the same phonetic principle by which the root *i*, "to go," forms, in the third person plural, *yanti*. From this *yanti*, therefore, the termination of

[G. Ed. p. 924.] *dd-q-yanti*, "they will give," cannot be distinguished. It cannot be denied, too, that the root *i*, "to go," to which Wühlner (Origin of Lingual Forms, §§. 46. 47.) has betaken himself in explaining the future, is, in respect of form, just as suitable as *i*. But the meaning "to wish," "to will," is certainly more adapted to express the future and the optative than that of "to go." This is also confirmed by the use of language, as several idioms, quite independent of one another, have simply, through internal impulse, come to the decision of expressing the future by "to will." It is certain that the Modern Greek and Old High German (§. 661.), nay, even the various German dialects, have, in this respect, borrowed nothing from one another nor imitated each other. The Old Sclavonic, also, sometimes employs an auxiliary verb, signifying "to will," to express the future. It is not, however, to be overlooked, that the examples which Dobrowsky (p. 380.) adduces from the translation of the Bible are all preceded by *μέλλω* in the Greek text; for which reason, unless other instances occur where this is not the case, we must conjecture that the wish of keeping as close as possible to the Greek text must have suggested to the Sclavonic translator his *χορμος choshchā*; thus Luke xxi. 7, χρηδα chotyat siya byti, έταν μέλλη τάτα*γένεσθαι; Matt. xi.14, chotyai priiti, ο μέλλων ˈέρχεσθαι. Respecting the conjectural
relationship of the Greek μέλαω with the Indian "manyē.
"I think," see p. 914 G. ed.

671. The Sanskrit sometimes uses its desiderative form to denote the future, as in the episode of the Draupadi mu-mūrṣhu, "wishing to die," occurs in the sense of "about to die;" and, conversely, in different languages, the expression of the future is occasionally used to denote that of "to will:" and the Latin forms its desideratives from [G. Ed. p. 925.] the future participle in tūrus, abbreviating the u, and adding the characteristic of the fourth conjugation, the ἰ of which, however, has nothing to do with the Sanskrit future suffix ya, but, as has been shewn, is founded on the characteristic of the tenth class ayn, which is frequently used in Sanskrit to form denominatives. The Greek forms desideratives from the future in σω, or perhaps from the older form in σίω; so that in forms like παραδωσεῖω, γελασεῖω, the ἰ would be strengthened only by a Gunising e. These desideratives, however, and the future, may be regarded as cognate forms, so that both, independently of each other, but by a similar formation, would have proceeded from the verbal theme, as there are in Sanskrit also desideratives, which have the form of the future but have not proceeded from it, but, following its analogy, have sprung from a nominal base; e.g. vrīṣha-syāmi, "to desire the bull," madhu-asyāmi, "to ask for honey." In the latter example the a of the root of the verb substantive is perhaps contained. But usually in denominative desideratives the verb substantive is quite omitted, or has become obsolete, and they only contain the syllable ya, i.e. the auxiliary verb "to wish," which is characteristic of the future; e.g. pati-yāmi, "I wish for a spouse," from pati, "spouse." It is not improbable that the desideratives which have been formed from primitive roots by the addition of a sibilant, and which are furnished with a syllable of reduplication, had originally a y after the sibilant, and therefore, likewise, the root of "to wish" alluded to;
thus, e.g. pipá-sámi, "I wish to drink," from pipá-syámi, agreeing with pá-syámi, "I will drink." If this is the case then pipásámi has the same relation to the presupposed pipásyámi that the Greek δώ-σω, from δώσω, has to the Sanskrit dásyámi. The root being burthened with the reduplication might, perhaps, produce a weakening in the final portion of the word, similar to that through which the reduplicated verbs in the third person plural have lost the nasal belonging to this person; and, e.g., bibhrati, "they carry," is said for bibhranti (§ 459.). We shall recur hereafter to the desideratives.

FORMATION OF THE MOODS

POTENTIAL, OPTATIVE, AND SUBJUNCTIVE.

672. The Sanskrit potential, which, with several peculiarities of use, combines in itself the meanings of the Greek subjunctive and optative, but in form adheres to the latter, is, in that conjugation which corresponds to the Greek ἐμ, formed by the syllable yat, which is prefixed to the personal terminations. The class peculiarities are retained; e.g. vidyám "sciam," from vid, class 2; bibhriyam "feram," from bhri, class 3; strinuyám, "sternam," from stri, class 5; syám for asyám, "sim," from as, class 2. We easily recognise the modal exponent yat in the Greek ἐμ, in which the semi-vowel has become a vowel, according to the Greek system of sounds: the i, however, always forms a diphthong with the preceding radical vowel, as there are no present forms like ἐδμ (Sanskrit admi, Lithuanian edmi), and therefore no optatives, too, like ἐδίνυ, which would resemble the Sanskrit adyám. But δίδοιν corresponds tolerably well to the Sanskrit dadyám, especially if its radical vowel is restored, which, through a particular irregularity, it has lost. According to rule, dadyám would correspond to the Greek δίδοιν; but the root ἀδ, under the retro-active influence of the heavy personal terminations and of the modal characteristic under discussion, suppresses...
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its radical vowel according to the same principle by which the Greek verb shortens its ω; thus 

\[ \text{adiyām} = \text{adiōīn̄} \]

as 

\[ \text{dadmas} = \text{dādōμεν} \]  

(see p. 698 G. ed.). The Sanskrit root \text{as}, “to be,” loses, by a special anomaly (which is, nevertheless, founded on the law of gravity, which acts with such astonishing consequences (§.480.)), its initial \text{a} in those places where \text{dā} drops its final vowel; hence 

\[ \text{syām} \]

“I may be,” answering to the Greek \text{ei̇n̄}, which I deduce from \text{ēsīn̄}, because \text{σ} between two vowels very easily admits of being dislodged, but the root \text{E}Σ firmly protects its vowel; hence, also, in the present indicative, \text{ēsmēv}, \text{ēsēṭe}, are more full than the Sanskrit cognate forms \text{smas, “we are,” s̄ha, “ye are.”}

673. The agreement of the Greek and Sanskrit is very remarkable in this point, that both languages have, in the middle, entirely lost the long vowel of the modal exponent \text{yā, η}; hence, \text{dādōīto, dādōīmeθa, for dādōīnto, dādōīmēθa, as in Sanskrit dadī̄ta, dadī̄n̄ahi, for dadyā̄ta, dadyā̄mahi}. The cause clearly lies in the weightier personal terminations of the middle; but I would not maintain, that the wound inflicted by them, in both languages, in one and the same place, on the preceding modal exponent, dates so early as the period when Greek and Sanskrit were still one. The principle of the form-weakening, retro-active influence of the weight of the personal terminations must, however, have existed at that time; and several circumstances in our European circle of languages point to this, that at the time of the identity of the languages, which are now separated, several convulsions took place in the organization of each family of languages. In the preceding case, however, the Greek \text{dādōīto} by its accent shews itself to be a comparatively recent contraction; for if the rejection of the \[ \text{G. Ed. p. 928.} \] \text{η} was primitive, and had taken place before the separation of languages, \text{dādōīto} would be accented like \text{λέγοιτο}. The Greek shews itself, too, in the suppression of the \text{η}, independent of the Sanskrit, in this, that it admits this vowel in the two plural numbers of the active, and for \text{dādōīmē̄n̄} employs also
902 POTENTIAL, OPTATIVE, AND SUBJUNCTIVE.

\( \ddot{d}d\ddot{d}o\dot{\ddot{i}}\dot{\ddot{m}}\epsilon v \), while the Sanskrit together with \( dady\ddot{a}ma \) has not a form \( daddima \), but both in this and in all verbs of the second conjugation the modal syllable \( y\ddot{a} \) is left unweakened in both the plural numbers of the active voice, although in other respects these two numbers follow the analogy of the middle, as their terminations are heavier than those of the singular.

674. The Latin subjunctive coincides in form with the Greek optative and Sanskrit potential. Its agreement with the former might have been perceived, without the intervention of the Sanskrit, from \( \text{sim}, \text{velim}, \text{edim}, \) and \( \text{duim} \), the modal \( i \) of which coincides with the Greek \( i \) of \( \ddot{d}d\ddot{d}o\dot{\ddot{i}}\dot{\ddot{m}}\epsilon v \). But these Latin forms resemble the Sanskrit still more closely than the Greek; for instance, \( \text{edim} \) answers admirably to the Sanskrit \( ady\ddot{a}m \), the \( y\ddot{a} \) of which, in the middle, if \( ad \) were used in that voice, must be contracted to \( i \), so that \( ad\dddot{m}-\text{mah}i \) would correspond to the Latin \( \text{edimus} \). Thus \( \text{sim} \), for \( \text{sim} \), answers to \( sy\ddot{a}m \), and \( \text{simus} \) still more exactly to the middle \( \text{st}mahi. \) The obsolete form \( \text{siem}, \text{sies}, \text{siet} \), corresponding to the Sanskrit \( sy\ddot{a}m, sy\ddot{a}s, sy\ddot{a}t \), is so far a grammatical jewel, that the full modal characteristic \( \dddot{\ddot{y}}\dddot{a} \), Greek \( \eta \), is contained in it, and it may thence be inferred, that \( \text{edim} \), also, &c., was preceded by an older \( \text{ediem}, \text{edies}, \text{ediet} = ady\ddot{a}m, ady\ddot{a}s, ady\ddot{a}t \), and \( \text{velim}, \text{duim}, \) &c., by a more full \( \text{veliem}, \text{dajem} \) (from \( dajem \)). The more weighty terminations of the plural have, by their retro-active shortening in-

[G. Ed. p. 929.] fluence, effected the suppression of the \( e \) before them earlier than before the more light terminations of the singular. It may, however, be reasonably assumed, that the forms \( \text{si}m\epsilon s, \text{sietis}, \text{sient} = sy\ddot{a}m, sy\ddot{a}t, sy\ddot{u}s \) (from \( sy\ddot{a}nt \)), have existed in some other more early epoch of the language; and to them, \( \text{simus}, \) &c., has the same relation that, in Greek, the abbreviated \( \ddot{d}d\ddot{d}o\dot{\ddot{i}}\dot{\ddot{m}}\epsilon v \) has to \( \ddot{d}d\ddot{d}o\dot{\ddot{i}}\dot{\ddot{m}}\epsilon v \).

675. The German, in which the subjunctive is likewise based on the Sanskrit potential and Greek optative, forms the preterite of this mood according to the principle of
FORMATION OF MOODS.

the Sanskrit second conjugation of the second, third, and seventh class, and of the Greek conjugation in μ, i.e. by attaching the modal element to the root direct; and, in fact, in Gothic, the first person in you resembles very strikingly the Sanskrit yām, only that the ā has been shortened, and the m vocalized to u (§. 432.). Compare, after removing what belongs to the relation of time, əlyau, "I ate,"* with the Sanskrit adyām, "I may eat." In the other persons, the Gothic follows the analogy of the Sanskrit and Greek middle; i.e. in suppressing the a of ya, while the y, as in Sanskrit, becomes long í, for which, in Gothic, ei is written; hence, əlt-ei-ma, Old High German ázımés, resembles the Sanskrit ad-i-mahi and Latin ed-i-mus; əlt-ei-th, Old High German ázít, the Sanskrit ad-i-dhwam, and Latin ed-i-tis; in the second person singular, əlt-ei-s (əlt-i-s) is almost identical with the Latin ed-i-s. In the third person, however, the personal sign has been lost (§. 432.), and in consequence of this loss the long í sound, which comes to stand at the end is shortened; thus ēti answering to the Sanskrit adīta and Latin edit.

676. It scarcely requires to be remarked, that I do not understand the resemblance between the Gothic əlt-ei-ma and Sanskrit ad-i-mahi, as though the Gothic subjunctive preterite, with exception of the first person singular, was really referable to the Sanskrit middle; the contraction of ya to ei=í is rather a pure Gothicism, which was probably preceded by a weakening of ya to yi, according to the principle by which nominal bases in ya exhibit in the nominative

* Ita, "I eat," from the root at, is so far the most remarkable verb of its class, because ētum, "we ate" (for ētum from a-atum, Old High German ázumés), contains a reduplication without having experienced abbreviation like sētum and similar forms' (p. 847 G. ed.). The Old High German ázumés corresponds almost as exactly as possible to the Sanskrit reduplicated ad-i-ma from a-adima.
singular *yi-s* for *ya-s*, in case this syllable is preceded by only one syllable, and, indeed, a short one. But if a vowel long by nature or by position, or more than one syllable precedes, the syllable *ya* is not only weakened to *yi*, but is contracted to long *i* (*ei*), and at the end of a word to short *i*; hence, *andeis* "end," for *andyis* from *andyas*, accusative *andi* for *andya*. Before a final nasal or *ns* the syllable *ya* remains in its original state; hence, in the dative plural, *andyam*, accusative *andyans*. On the same phonetic law is based the phenomenon that the *u* of the first person singular of our modal-form, which has arisen from *m*, has preserved the syllable *ya* in its complete form; and hence, *élyam* from *élyam*, "I ate," may be compared with the dative plural *andyam*; *léis*, "thouatest," with the nominative and genitive singular *andeis*; and the third person singular *éti*, which terminates with short *i*, with the accusative *andi*.

677. In Old Sclavonic there are some remains of the Greek conjugation in *μ*, or the Sanskrit second conjugation. These have preserved the personal termination in the first person singular of the present, and in the imperative (which I believe I must in its formation identify with the Sanskrit-Zend potential, the Latin-German subjunctive, and Greek optative) annex

[G. Ed. p. 931.] the exponent of the modal relation direct to the root. The modal characteristic, however, has preserved only the semi-vowel of the Sanskrit *yā*, and as in the second person singular the *s* of *yās*, since from the oldest period it has stood at the end, must, according to a universal law of sound, disappear, so अाजाद याच्छद्य (euphonic for *yady*), "eat," corresponds to the Sanskrit *adyas*, "thou mayest eat," and Latin *edis*; बाज़ा व्याच्छद्य (for *vyedy*), "know," to the Sanskrit *vidyās*; and अाजाद दाच्छद्य (dady), "give," to the Greek δῶ�ις, and still more to the Sanskrit *dadyas*, since, like it, it has lost the radical vowel. The Sclavonic forms which have been cited pass also as third persons; for यास्य *yēs*,
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ydt cannot be distinguished in Scdlavonic, because the rule for the extirpation of final consonants has spared the t as little as the s, while the Greek admits the Σ at the end, there also, where, in the lingual epoch preceding that of the Greek, it stood as the last pillar of the word; and thus δίδοις can be distinguished from δίδοι, which is deprived of the personal sign.

678. In the first person plural, ἡδὰμης γαςχδυμή, ββηδαμης γαςχδυμη, ἡδὰμης δαςχδυμη, answer to ἡδαμος ἄδιμας, εδίμους, είδαμος ειδήμας, ἡδαμος δαδίμας, δίδοιμεν, δοίμους; and in the second, ἡδαμτε γαςχδυτε, ββηδατε γαςχδυτε, ἡδατε δαςχδυτε, το ἡδατον ἄδιτα, εδίτης, είδατος ειδήτα, ἡδατον δαδίτα, δίδοιτε, δοίτης. The second person plural represents, in the Old Scdlavonic imperative, also the third person; a misuse which may have been favored by the fact, that in the singular the third person is not distinguished from the second, from reasons connected with the law of sounds; and in the dual, also, the terminations ταμ, ταμ, for which the Greek uses τον, την, have both become τα; for though the Slavonic a generally represents the long Sanskrit a, still it sometimes stands for the short a also; and therefore τα has as good a foundation in the second person dual as in the third; but [G. Ed. p. 932.] through the elsewhere very common corruption of a to e the dual second person has become like that of the plural. Moreover, the second person is most used in the imperative, and this may have been an additional cause why, in the plural, the third person has been entirely removed from lingual existence, which is therefore less surprising than that, in Old and Anglo-Saxon, the second person plural should represent the other two in the present indicative also. But if, in the Old Scdlavonic imperative, the genuine third person plural had remained in use, it would, in my opinion, be the same as the second and third of the singular; for the final consonantal sounds of the Greek-Zend εν, δήν, or εν, and Latin nt, would
have given way, and as the vowel of the modal expression \( \text{yd} \) has, in general, disappeared, only \( \text{Daschdy} \) could have corresponded to the Zend \( \text{dadiyain} \), Greek \( \text{didoie} \), and Old Latin \( \text{duint} \). This apparent identity with two persons of the singular might have accorded less with the language than the actual exchange for one of the same number.

679. I refer, also, the Lithuanian imperative, in its origin, to the department of the mood here discussed; for in all verbs, without exception, the vowel \( i \) is its characteristic, which admits of no other comparison than with the Slavonic \( y \), just mentioned, the Greek \( i \) of all optatives, the Latin \( i \) of \( \text{sim}, \text{edim}, \text{velim}, \text{duim} \), and the Sanskrit-Zend \( \text{yd} \), or \( t \). The Lithuanian imperative, however, gains a peculiar appearance, and one which estranges it from the corresponding mood of the cognate languages, in that it conceals the true exponent of the modal relation after a \( k \), which is always prefixed to the \( i \); only if the root itself ends with \( k \), for two \( k \)'s only one is used. As in the second person singular, in which the \( i \) ought to conclude the form, 

[G. Ed. p. 933.] this final vowel is generally suppressed, but the \( k \) is extended to all persons of the imperative, with the exception of the third, of which hereafter, we may be easily tempted to regard this \( k \) as the true imperative suffix, and thus quite disengage the Lithuanian in this mood from its otherwise close union with the other cognate languages. From the root \( \text{bu} \), “to be,” proceed, e.g., the forms \( \text{buki} \), or \( \text{buk} \), “be thou,” \( \text{bukite} \), “be ye,” \( \text{bukime} \), “let us be,” \( \text{bukiwa} \), “let us two be,” \( \text{bukita} \), “ye two be.” So \( \text{duki} \), or \( \text{duk} \), “give thou,” \( \text{dukite} \), “give ye,” &c. In most cases it happens that the \( k \) appears between two vowels: for, in the preceding examples, the root, and in Mielke's three last conjugations, the class syllable, corresponding to the Sanskrit \( \text{aya} \) (§. 506.), end with a vowel: and as the verb \( \text{suk} \), “I turn,” given as example of the first conjugation, on account of the \( k \), which terminates
the root, abstains from the affix under discussion, Mielke's Grammar, therefore, is utterly deficient in an instance exhibiting the combination of the k of the imperative with a consonant. But Ruhig gives, from laupsinū, "I praise," the imperative laupsink' (laupsinki), and, according to Mielke's rule, given at p. 78, we must expect from infinitives like ras-ti, "to find" (euphonic for rad-ti), imperatives like ras-k', or ras-ki, since a k should take the place of the infinitive suffix.

680. As respects the origin of the k, which is peculiar to the Lithuanian imperative, it is probably, as has been already observed, a corruption of the s of the verb substantive, and consequently dâki, "give thou," is doubly related to the Old Slavonic dach, "I gave," and to the Greek êdôka, déôka (see §§. 568. 569.), as also to the Zend dâkhyêmi, "I will give," (= Sanskrit dâsyâmi), which I am unable to quote, but which I [G. Ed. p. 934.] believe I may safely deduce from the above-mentioned participle of the root dâ, "to lay," which has the same sound with dâ, "to give" (see §. 669.). The same relation that the Zend future dâkhyêmi has to the Sanskrit dâsyâmi is held, as respects the employing a guttural instead of an original sibilant, by the Lithuanian dûki to the Sanskrit precative middle dâsîya. In the dual, the Lithuanian dûkiwa answers to the Sanskrit dâsîvahi, and, in the plural, dûkime to dâsîmahî. The Sanskrit precative is, however, in fact, nothing else than a modification of the potential, and has, in essentials, the same relation to it that the Greek aorist optative has to the present optative; i.e. the class differences are removed. Compare dêyás, dêyât, for dâyás, dâyât;* Zend dâyāo, dâyāt, with dôiŋ, dôiŋ. In all the other persons, the Sanskrit adds

* A radical d, in most roots, passes into t, through the assimilating influence, as it appears, of the y following; but not in Zend
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an s, i.e. the verb substantive, to the modal exponent yd, and
thus dêyâsam resembles the Greek third person plural doînâv.
This dissimilar introduction of the verb substantive may
be regarded as a phenomenon, which first made its appear-
ance after the separation of the languages; for which
reason the Zend, though it continued with the Sanskrit
much longer than the European cognate idioms, does not
share in it, and in the plural contrasts देयासम dàyâma,
देयसृ dàyâta, देयायन dàyânān,* with the Greek doîmêv,
doînê, doîen, and Sanskrit dêyâsma, dêyâstu, dêyâsus. In
the first person singular I find द्यानम dyanm (probably
erroneously for dâyanm) in a passage already cited with a
different object (see p. 277), a form in good analogy with
the Greek doînv, for which in Sanskrit dêyâsma.

681. In the middle, the Sanskrit, in the precative, com-
[G. Ed. p. 935.] mits to the verb substantive the function of
denoting the modal relation, exactly as, in the future of the
two active forms, the relation of time. As, therefore, in
dà-syâmi, “dubo,” the last portion is the future of the verb sub-
stantive, so in dà-stî-ya,† “I may give,” its precative or po-
tential aorist is contained, and the Lithuanian dû-ki, “give
thou” (without any personal termination), is rightly analogous
to dâśî, the sibilant being hardened to k, which alone dis-
tinguishes the imperative from the future. Compare
dû-kite, “give ye,” with dû-site, “ye will give.” In spite,
however, of the great agreement between dû-ki and dà-stî,
it is still requisite to assume that the Lithuanian has
brought with it from its Asiatic place of origin the pre-
ceding form of its imperative, and that dû-ki-te, “give ye,”
is the transmission of the Sanskrit dà-stî-dhwam, “detis,” with
the substitution only of an active personal termination for
a middle one; but the very natural accession of the verb

* Compare Burnouf’s Yaçna, Note S, pp. CL, CLII.
† The y is a euphonic insertion, and a, for ma, the termination.
substantive may be admitted in both languages independently of one another. The firm adherence to the ancient modal character, the original ย which has been contracted in the Sanskrit middle preceptive and potential, to ถ, in the Lithuanian imperative to ใบ, has, in the preceding case, effected a surprising similarity in the languages, which have been from time immemorial distinct, and subject to their own separate destiny. The conjecture, however, that the ถ of the Lithuanian imperative has arisen from ย, is supported by the Old Prussian, which is most intimately connected with the Lithuanian, and which furnishes us with an optative or subjunctive, in which ย is contrasted with the Lithuanian ใบ; at least, I have no doubt that forms like ดา-ย, "he may give,"* ยล-ย, "he may help," ป-ย, "he may be," ป-ย, "they may be," ถสิ-ย, "he may be silent" (Sanskrit [G. Ed. p. 936.] ยส tỉnh, "still," "silent"), are to be looked upon as cognate forms of the Lithuanian imperative and Sanskrit preceptive; and thus ดา-ย (without a personal termination, like the Greek δοίη) may be contrasted with the Sanskrit ดา-ย-ย, "he may give."

682. In support of my assertion that the Lithuanian imperative is based on the Sanskrit preceptive, not on the potential, which answers to the Greek optative present, may be specially adduced the circumstance that, in the latter case, in those verbs which correspond to the Sanskrit first class, it would necessarily retain the vowel inserted between the root and the personal termination. E.g. the inserted ย of ยез-ย-ย, "we ride," ยез-ย-ย, "ye ride," would not be lost, but most probably we should have in their place ยез-ย-ย, ยез-ย-ย, which would be analogous to the Gothic ย-ย-ย, ย-ย-ย, to the Greek ย-ย-ย, ย-ย-ย, and

* See Vater's Language of the Old Prussians, pp. 104 and 107.
Sanskrit vah-ē-ma, vah-ē-ta (from vahāima, vahāila). But according to the view just developed, wefz-ki-mē, wefz-ki-tē, are founded, not on vah-ē-ma, vah-ē-ta, but on vak-śhē-mahi, vak-śhē-dhwam, apart from the middle terminations. The Lettish, however, in its imperatives, has retained, of the two modifications of the Sanskrit mood under discussion, the first, or the potential, corresponding to the Greek optative present; and, in the second person plural, always uses ai or ee in the place of the indicative a; and thus darrait, “do ye” (faciatis), corresponds, in its relation to darrat, “ye do,”* admirably to the Gothic subjunctives like lis-ai-ts,

[G. Ed. p. 337.] “ye two may read,” as contrasted with the indicative lis-a-ts. I give the dual, as this has the advantage of having, in the indicative, retained the old a in its original form; while in the plural lisith, as in general before a final th, that letter has become i. The two twin sisters, therefore, the Lithuanian and Lettish, complete one another’s deficiencies in the imperative admirably, since the one supplies us with the Sanskrit potential, and the other with its aorist form, or the precative, and, in fact, furnishes us with the same method of formation (which is the more important) that is to be assigned peculiarly to the middle, and does not occur elsewhere in any other European cognate idiom; while, as has been said, the

* Though the form in ait or eet occurs in the indicative also, still here that in at is the prevailing and general one: in the imperative, however, that in eet or ait is the only one, and therefore characteristic of the mood. The true pronunciation of the Lettish diphthong ee is hard to be perceived from the description given by Rosenberger, p. 6: it is sufficient, however, for our purpose here, that this diphthong is etymologically only a corruption of ai, and, like this, corresponds to the Sanskrit ē (=a+i); as, in deews, “God,” देवस्, देव-स, from दिव्, “to shine”; eet, “he goes,” एटि, from रि, “he goes,” एटि, from रि; smee-t, “to laugh,” in the root answers to the Sanskrit smi, whence by Gunn, through insertion of an a, smb.
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active process of formation is reflected in the Greek second aorist optative, where, in the third person plural, δοίγαιαν is contrasted with the Sanskrit देयासुस for देयासांत, and δοीν with the Zend देर्याविन.

683. The second person singular of the Lettish imperative is always identical with the corresponding person of the indicative, and here requires no further discussion; and thus, that which in Lithuanian is adduced as the third person imperative, is nothing else than the third person of the indicative present, which receives its modal function, corresponding more with the subjunctive than the imperative, by the prefix of the conjunction te. There are, however, some so-called anomalous verbs, which have a form differing from the indicative, and this is in reality an unmistakeable brother of the Sanskrit potential of the second conjugation, or of the Greek optative present of the conjugation in μ. The personal character has (as usually [G. Ed. p. 938.] happens in all tenses of the indicative) been dropped; and thus ie corresponds to the Greek η, Latin iet from siet, and the Sanskrit-Zend yāत, yāत. For example, essie corresponds to the Greek εῖν (from εἰν), to the Latin siet, and Sanskrit syāत, but exceeds the Latin and Sanskrit in preserving the radical vowel (as in esmē, contrasted with s-mas, sumus), and the Greek εῖν, in retaining the consonant of the root, which is, however, doubled, as occurs in Lettish, also, in several persons of the indicative; e. g. in essam, "we are," essat, "ye are."

684. The Lithuanian dūdyė, "let him give," answers to the Greek δῶιν, Sanskrit dadyāt, and Zend daidhyāt. The agreement with the two last forms, however, is the greater, as the radical vowel is lost in the base itself; thus dū-die for dūdūye, as in Sanskrit da-dyāt for dadāyāt, and in Zend daidhyāt for dadhāyāt. The relation of dūdie to the other unreduplicated persons of the imperative, as dūki, dūkime, &c., is exactly that of the potential in
Sanskrit and Zend to the preceptive, and in Greek that of the present optative to the aorist of that mood; thus, as द्द्यत dādayat is related to दे-यत (for dāyat, middle dā-sīṣṭa), or as in Zend dādhyāt to dādhyāt, and in Greek ἁδοῖν to ἀοῖ, so is dādie, "let him give," to dūki, "give." In this lies a new, and, in fact, very strong proof, that the Lithuanian imperative in the third person of anomalous verbs belongs to the potential or optative present, but in the other persons to the preceptive or optative aorist; and that the k of dūki is identical with the k of ἐδωκα and the s of ἀσία. It is proper here to recall attention to the division of the Sanskrit tenses and [G. Ed. p. 939.] moods into special and general. The latter, to which belongs the preceptive, as, in Greek, the aorist, have the class-sign removed, which, in dadāmi, ᾧωμ, and the Lithuanian dûdu, consists in the reduplication: this therefore, is wanting in dēyāsām, dā-ν-, ν, ἀοῖ, dūki, according to the same principle by which the verb under discussion forms, in the three languages, the future dā-syām, ἀσω, dā-su. The Lithuanian root bu, "to be" (=Sanskrit bhā), in consonance with this principle, forms, in the plural of the future, bu-si-me, and in that of the imperative bu-ki-me; with which latter we would compare the corresponding Sanskrit preceptive form bhāv-i-śi-mahi: on the other hand, buwa-ū, "I was," belongs to the special theme abhavam (§. 522). With regard however, to Mielke's second, third, and fourth conjugations preserving the class character in the imperative, this proceeds from their belonging to the Sanskrit tenth class, which extends its ay also to the general tenses; and, e.g., from चुर chur, "to steal," the preceptive middle is चोरियो मं chōr-ayi-śiṣṭa, plural chōr-ayi-śiṣṭa. The i of ayi is a conjunctive vowel, which in other classes, also frequently enters between the attributive root and the verb substantive. After rejecting this conjunctive vowel, ay would be of necessity
contracted to \( t \), and then \( ch\text{-}r\text{-}sh\text{-}ivahi, ch\text{-}r\text{-}sh\text{-}mahi, \) would be identical with Lithuanian forms like \( pen\text{-}\-kiwa, \) “let us two nourish,” \( pen\text{-}\-kime, \) “let us nourish,” as regards the class-syllable.

685. The Lithuanian offers, beside the imperative, another mood, which we must bring into comparison with the Sanskrit preceptive; — I mean the subjunctive, which has only an imperfect to exhibit, which we append in full from the root \( d\text{u}, \) “to give,” with the addition of the corresponding form of the Lettish, which is requisite in this place, in order to understand the Lithuanian.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SINGULAR</th>
<th>PLURAL</th>
<th>DUAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LITHUAN.</td>
<td>LETTISH.</td>
<td>LITHUAN.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dūchīau, es dohtu.</td>
<td>dūtumbime, mehs dohtum.</td>
<td>dūtumbiwa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dūtumbei, tu dohtu.</td>
<td>dūtumbite, yuhs dohtut.</td>
<td>dūtumbita.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dūtu,</td>
<td>winsch1 dohtu.</td>
<td>dūtu,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Feminine winyny
2 Feminine winynyas.

The third person singular, which, as is universally the case in Lithuanian and Lettish, represents, at the same time, the plural, and, in Lithuanian, also the dual, would, considered of itself, lead us to the Sanskrit imperative, in which \( d\text{a}d\text{u}tu \), “let him give,” is identical in termination with \( d\text{u}tu, dohtu \); and the phenomenon, that the Lettish \( dohtu \) also passes as second and first person, might be regarded as the consequence of an erroneous use of language; like that, by which, in Old and Anglo-Saxon, the second person plural of the present, and the third of the preterite, have made their way into the other persons also. Still I regard the \( tu \) under discussion, not as a personal termination, but as identical with the \( tum \) of the other persons, and I consider \( d\text{u}tu \) an abbreviation of \( d\text{u}tumbi \), particularly as, in the first person plural, \( d\text{u}tum \) may be used for \( d\text{u}tumbime \) (Mielke, p. 143, b), in which case the \( m \)
is to be regarded as the character of the first person, and

[G. Ed. p. 941.] is not to be confounded with that which precedes the b in the full form dūtumbime. I deduce this from the Lettish, which has everywhere dislodged the syllable bi, together with the m preceding, but which combines the tu, which remains in the plural with the personal sign, but in the singular, as this number has in general lost the consonants of the terminations, leaves it without any addition; thus, es, tu, winsch dohtu. A clear intimation is thus given us, that also in the Lithuanian first person singular the form dūchiau, and such as resemble it, must be regarded as strongly mutilated; and I have no doubt that dūchiau has arisen from dūtumbiau, by suppressing the umb. Thus the t came into direct contact with several combined vowels, and therefore was necessarily changed into ch, according to a universal law of sound. The abbreviation of dūtumbiau to dūchiau (for dūtiau) is not greater than that before mentioned of dūtu(mbi)me to dūtum for dūtume. In both cases three letters have been omitted; in the first, mb, with the preceding vowel; in the second, with the vowel following.

686. The Lithuanian subjunctive is very important to me, as I recognise in the syllable bi the true exponent of the modal relation, and in this a more than casual coincidence with the expression of the Latin future of the first and second conjugation, which is in form completely the same. Compare da-bimus with dūtum-bime, da-bitis with dūtum-bite, da-bis with dūtum-bei, from dūtum-bi-i, da-bo for dabio, with the dūtum-biau presupposed above, and dabit with the dūtum-bi abbreviated to dātu, likewise only supposed. The identification, however, of a Latin future form with the subjunctive of a cognate language will surprise us the less, as the Latin itself, within its own lingual province, places the future and subjunctive on the same footing in

[G. Ed. p. 942.] this point, that futures like lēyes, leyet,
legēmus, legētis, coincide in form with the subjunctives of the first conjugation.

687. The i of the Lithuanian bi corresponds, there is scarce any doubt, to the Sanskrit-Zend modal character ýa, which, in combination with bhā, "to be," forms, in the third person of the precative, bhūyāt bhūyāt, ṭuṣmāṣṭi buyāt. The Lithuanian has dropped the u of its root bu, whether on account of its appearing in a compound, or because the u stood before a vowel, while everywhere else it appeared before consonants: the syllable ýa, however, is retained pretty perfectly in the first person singular in iau, and in the other persons, on the contrary, it is contracted to i. Compare biau (from biam, see §. 438.) with the Zend ṭuṣmāṣṭi bhuaim (from buyām), and bime, bite, from buyame, buyate, with ṭuṣmāṣṭi buyāma, ṭuṣmāṣṭi buyāta. As regards the first part of the Lithuanian compound dátum-bei, &c., we easily recognise in it the Sanskrit infinitive and the accusative of the Latin supine—दातम् dátum, datum. In its isolated state the Lithuanian supine ends in tu, but the lost sign of the accusative has in the compound been preserved in its original form under the protection of the auxiliary verb following, and principally of the labial initial sound answering to m, while everywhere else, in Lithuanian, the accusative m has become ni (§. 149.).

688. The Sanskrit first conjugation suppresses the á of the potential character ýa both in the active and in the middle,*

* This suppression would be favored by the facility with which the y vocalized to i, becomes a diphthong with a preceding it. The prime inducement for it, however, was the effort to lighten the modal element in combination with a verbal theme, which, without that, was of two, or, in the tenth class, of three syllables; thus, bō-dhes, "thou mayest know," for bōdh-a-yās; kāmnyēs, "thou mayest love," for kām-a-yās. In the second conjugation the combination of the modal syllable ýa with radical á (there are no roots in short a) occurs only in monosyllabic verbal themes; e.g. bhā-yām. Roots of the third class, however, as they become polysyllabic
and the $y$ vocalized to $i$ is contracted, with the preceding $a$ of the class syllable, to $e$; e.g. भरेः $bharēs$, "thou mayest bear," for $bhar-a-yās$, as, in Greek, φερός for $ϕεροῖς$ ($ϕερ-ο-ίς$). I am not, however, of opinion, that the diphthong, which is expressed, in Sanskrit by $ṛ$, and is now spoken as $ē$, had in the earliest time, before the separation of languages, a pronunciation in which neither $a$ nor $i$ was perceptible; but it is most probable that the two elements were heard in combination, and spoken as $ai$, which $ai$ may have been distinguished from the $Vṛiddhi$ diphthong $ṛdi$ by this, that the same breadth was not given to the pronunciation of the $a$ sound that it has in $di$. The same must have been the case with the $ō$: it was pronounced like $au$, and its $Vṛiddhi$ ($§$. 29.), like $āu$. For to keep to the $ṛ ē$, if this diphthong

polysyllabic by reduplication, lighten the roots by suppressing the $d$, as $dā-yaṁ$ for $دادā-یام$, $jah-yaṁ$ for $جاهā-یام$ (compare $§$. 482.) The ninth class weakens its class syllable $nā$ to $ni$, as before heavy personal terminations ($§$. 485.); thus, $yu-nā-yaṁ$ for $yu-na-yaṁ$; and therefore the combination of the full modal exponent $yā$ with the heaviest kind of vowel is, in polysyllabic themes, entirely avoided. The roots which annex $nu$ or $u$ do not suffer any weakening either in the base or in the modal character, for the $ō$ of $yā$ cannot here be lost, since the $i$ cannot become a diphthong with the $u$ preceding: the $u$ of the class syllable, however, is not necessarily weakened, since $u$ is itself one of the lighter vowels; hence, e.g., $āp-nu-yaṁ$, "I may obtain." To this would correspond, in Greek, forms like δεικνύων, which, however, as it appears, are avoided on account of the difficulty of pronouncing them, and carried into the $ω$ conjugation; while the remains of forms, which have remained true to their own conjugation, have suppressed the $i$, and, in compensation, lengthened the $v$; thus $ἐπίδεικνύομην$ for $ἐπίδεικνύομην$.
FORMATION OF MOODS.

in Lithuanian in one place as ai, in another as e; in Lettish new as ai, now as e or ee (see §. 682., Note); in Latin sometimes as ae, as the next descent from ai, sometimes as e. But if before the separation of languages the diphthong still had its right pronunciation, then each particular individual of the family of languages which arose after the separation may have either always or occasionally preserved in its full value the ai which had been brought with it from the land of its origin; or invariably or occasionally contracted it to e; and as it is natural to derive e from ai, many of the cognate languages coincide in this process of melting down. While, however, the Sanskrit, according to the pronunciation which has been received by us, causes the diphthong ai, when in a position before consonants, to be invariably taken as e, the Greek exhibits the opposite extreme, and displays to us the Sanskrit diphthong as ai, ei, or oe, and, in fact, in the preceding case, as oe, since the class vowel, which, in the indicative, appears as o only before nasals, in combination with the modal exponent i, invariably assumes the o quality. The η, however, of the full modal exponent η, as in Sanskrit the η, is suppressed; thus τέρπ-οι-ς, τέρπ-οι-(τ), answering to tarp-θ-s, tarp-θ-t; τέρπ-οι-του, τέρπ-οι-την, to tarp-θ-lam, tarp-θ-ldm; τέρπ-οι-μεν, τέρπ-οι-τε, to tarp-θ-ma, tarp-θ-la.

689. It has been already remarked (§. 430.) that the first person singular in oim is an inorganic form, and that τυπτοίμην points to an active form τύπτων. When I first advanced this conjecture I was not aware that the [G. Ed. p. 945.] form arrived at by theory has been actually transmitted to us, though but in the single case of τρέφοιν. Besides this, Matthiae (§. 198. 2.) proposes to read ἀμάρτον instead of ἀμαρτεῖν in Suidas. We will leave it undecided here, whether the forms oίν, oίς, &c., which occur in contracted verbs, have preserved the original form, and are thus more genuine than those in Sanskrit like tarp-θ-s for tarp-a-yas, or whether, as is more probable, they are carried back by
the analogy of the $\mu$ conjugation. The Sanskrit interposes a euphonic $y$ between the diphthong $\acute{e}$, and, in the second conjugation, between the $i$ shortened from $yd$, and the personal terminations commencing with a vowel (§. 43.); hence, tarpē-y-am, answering to the Greek τέρποιμι for τέρπον. Regarding the termination am for simple $m$, which would make the euphonic $y$ superfluous, and attest a form tarpēm for tarpēyam, see §. 437., Remark.

690. The Latin, in its subjunctives of the first conjugation, exhibits, like the Sanskrit in the form of $\acute{e}$, the diphthong which has arisen from the class syllable and the modal vowel $i$; but in the first and third person singular, through the influence of the final $m$ and $t$, this is shortened; thus, amem, amet, in opposition to amēs, amēmus, amētis. The kindred formation of these words with the Greek, like τέρποιμι, τέρποιμεν, τέρποντε, would perhaps never be discovered without the medium of the Sanskrit. But if amēs, amēt, amēmus, amētis, be compared with the Sanskrit forms of the same meaning, kāmayēs, kāmayēt, kāmayēmu, kāmayēta, it must be assumed that the last $a$ of the class character सय aya (whence we have deduced the Latin $a$ ($=a + a$) of amē-re (§. 109*. 6.), by the dislodgement of the $y$), has combined with the modal $i$, while in the $a$ of amēs, amēmus, amētis, the two $a$ of [G. Ed. p. 946.] kām-a(y)a-si, kām-a(y)λ-mus, kām-a(y)a-tha, are united. The $\acute{e}$, therefore, of amēs, &c., corresponds to the Greek $\omicron$ in forms like τιμάοις, φιλέοις, δηλώοις (§. 109*. 6.), and the preceding short vowel is passed over. In the obsolete forms verberit, temperint (Struve, p. 146), the first part, also, of the diphthong $\acute{e}$ ($=a + i$) has been lost, and only the pure modal element has been left. They may have arisen from the consciousness that an $i$ was bound up in the $e$ of verberet, temperent, or they may have followed the principle of sit, velit, edit (§. 674.). On the other hand, do really belongs to the Sanskrit second conjugation, and to the Greek in $\mu$, and therefore duim, perduim, are regular forms
the \( i \) of which corresponds to the Sanskrit \( y \) of \( \text{dad-ya'm} \) and to the Greek \( \iota \) of \( \delta\delta\iota\nu\nu \). The weakening of the \( a \) to \( u \) in \( \text{duim} \) rests, perhaps, on the circumstance, that \( ui \) is a more favorite combination than \( a\ddot{u} \).

691. In \( \text{moneds} \), \( \text{moned'mus} \), &c., is contained the whole of the Sanskrit causal theme \( \text{mdn-aya} \), "to make to think" (see p. 121 G. ed.), only that the properly long \( \dot{e} \) (from \( a + i = \text{Sanskrit ay} \)) is, on account of its position, shortened before a vowel, the \( i \) of the modal expression has disappeared, and, in compensation, the preceding vowel is lengthened, according to the principle of Greek optatives with \( \ddot{u} \) for \( ui \). As, therefore, \( \varepsilon\pi\delta\epsilon\iota\kappa
\nu\mbox{\eta}\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu \) stands for \( \varepsilon\pi\delta\epsilon\iota\kappa\nu\mbox{\eta}\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu \), \( \delta\alpha\iota\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu \), \( \pi\gamma\nu\nu\nu\nu \), \( \delta\alpha\iota\nu\nu\nu\nu \), \( \pi\gamma\nu\nu\nu\nu \), so \( \text{moneds} \) for \( \text{monenais} \). On the other hand, the case is the same with \( \text{carint} \) (Struve, p. 146), for \( \text{careaint} \) from \( \text{careaïnt} \), as with the before-mentioned \( \text{verberit}, \text{temperint} \).

692. The same relation that \( \text{moneds} \) has to \( \text{monês} \) is held by \( \text{audids} \), from \( \text{audiais} \), to \( \text{audis} \) (§§. 190*. 6., 505.). The future, however, which in the third and fourth conjugation is, in fact, nothing else than a subjunctive, as was first remarked in my System of Conjugation (p. 98, with which Struve agrees, pp. 145, 146), has preserved the modal element, and has been contracted with the \( a \) of the class [G. Ed. p. 947.] character to \( \ddot{e} \), with the exception of the first person singular, in which \( \text{legem}, \text{audiem} \), should stand for \( \text{legam}, \text{audiam} \). In the older language \( \text{dicem}, \text{faciem} \), are actually transmitted to us by Quintilian, as forms used by Cato Censor (compare Struve, p. 147); and thus, in the fourth conjugation, forms like \( \text{audiem} \) may well have existed. As, however, in the proper subjunctive the last element of the diphthong \( \dot{ai} \) has cast itself upon the \( a \), and lengthened that letter, but in the future has been contracted with the \( a \) to \( \dot{e} \), two forms have arisen from that which was originally one, of which each has received for representation a portion of that meaning, which properly belongs to the two together; as, in the history of language, similar cases have often arisen, and, \( \text{e.g.}, \text{datûri} \).
and datāres (I give the plural intentionally) both conduct us to the Sanskrit dātāras, which unites the meaning of the two Latin forms in itself. The use of the subjunctive in the sense of a future reminds us of the periphrasis for the future by means of auxiliary verbs which signify "to be requisite," or "to will," as also of the occasional use of the Zend imperative in the sense of the future (see §. 680. p. 912 G. ed.). It is clear, however, that the expression of the future, from the most ancient period, has bordered with surprising closeness on the relation denoted by the Latin subjunctive, since the two are distinguished in Sanskrit, only by the quantity of the vowel —ya in the future, and ya in the potential.

693. The future and subjunctive of the Latin third conjugation may perhaps require a little further consideration, though what is most important to be observed respecting them is already deducible from what has been remarked regarding the second and fourth conjugations. Future forms like vehēs, vehēmus, have already appeared in my System of Conjugation as akin to the Sanskrit potentials like vahēs, vahēma, and

[G. Ed. p. 948.] Latin subjunctives as amēs, amēmus. But in the first conjugation the ē was firmly planted; for even if in its ē a contraction of the Sanskrit aya of the tenth class were not recognised, still the ē is clear to every one's eyes, and also the possibility of melting it down with the i of the subjunctive expression which follows to ē. But the ē of vehēs, vehēmus appeared incomprehensible, or as a transmission from the third conjugation to the first, as long as the i of veh-i-s, veh-i-mus, passed as the original form of the class vowel of the third conjugation. Through the observation, however, made above (p. 104), according to which the intermediate vowel of the third conjugation is only a secondary i weakened from a, forms like vehēs, vehēmus, must now appear in a totally different light. Their ē contains the primitive a, which has become weakened in the indicative, as it occurs elsewhere also, that a word in composition has maintained
itself in a form more close to its original state than when isolated and unprotected.* Before the forms veh-ū-s, veh-ū-mus, had become corrupted to veh-i-s, veh-i-mus, in the indicative, veh-ē-s, veh-ē-mus, had arisen from them, and, in the subjunctive, vehds, vehdmus; and the corruption of the class, vowel of the indicative could have had no influence over that which was melted down with the modal character.†

694. The Latin third conjugation leads us to the Gothic, in which all the twelve classes of Grimm's strong conjugation coincide with the Latin third (§. 109*. 1.). [G. Ed. p. 949.] The Gothic has, however, this advantage over the Latin, that it has not admitted the corruption of the old a of the indicative throughout, but only before a final s and th; otherwise it has retained the a. We must, therefore, carefully avoid deriving the forms bairais, "fersus," bairai, "ferat," bairaith, "feratis," from the indicative bairis, hairith, Bairith, by the insertion of an a, which would imply a principle of formation quite unknown in the Indo-European family of languages; but the said subjunctive forms must be regarded as the creations of a period in which their indicative prototypes were still Bairas, Bairaith, to which also the passive forms Bair-a-za, Bair-a-da, as regards the intermediate vowel, refer us (§. 466.). In the second person of the dual and the first of the plural Bair-ai-ts, Bai-ai-ma, have the same relation to the indicative Bair-a-ts, Bair-a-m, that, in Sanskrit, Bhur-ē-tum, Bhur-ē-ma (from Bhur-ai-tam, Bhur-ai-ma), have to Bhur-a-thas, Bhur-ū-mas; in the third person

* Thus the guttural of the Latin facio has been retained in the French magnifique, while in fais, faisons, it has been corrupted to s, or, according to the pronunciation, has been lost entirely in fais.

† I have brought forward this theory for the first time in the Berl. Jahrb., Jan. 1834, pp. 97, 98 (see Vocalismus, p. 200), to which A. Benary assents (Doctrine of Roman Sounds, pp. 27, 28), who, however, derives the modal vowel i from i, "to go." (Compare §. 670.)
plural bair-ai-na (transposed from bair-ai-au), "ferant," has the same relation to bair-a-and, "ferunt," that the Zend bar-ay-in has to bar-a-ni, and the Greek φέρ-ο-ευ to φέρ-ο-ντι. In the first person dual the relation of bair-ai-va to bair-ös, from bair-a-vas (§ 441.), rests on the same principle on which, in Sanskrit, that of bhar-ë-va to bhar-å-vas is founded.* In the first person singular bairau, "I may bear," the modal vowel i is wanting, but the u is the vocalization of the personal character m; bairau, therefore (from bairaim), has the same relation to bairais, bairai, &c., that, in Latin, the future feram (for ferem) has to ferès, feret, [G. Ed. p. 950.] from ferais, ferait.† The Old High German exhibits the Gothic diphthong ai (=, see §. 78.), also, graphically in the form ê, but shortens it at the end of a word; hence, bere (for berê), "feram," "ferat," has the same relation to berês (= Sanskrit bharês), "feras," berêmê, "feramus" that, in Latin, amem, amet, bear to amês, amêmus.

695. The Old Prussian, a dialect which resembles the Lithuanian very closely, employs imperatives like immais, "take thou," immaiti, "take ye," which stand in a clearer relation to their indicative forms imm-ä-se, imm-ä-ti, than, in Gothic, nim-ai-s, "sumas," nim-ai-th, "sumatis," to nim-ä-s, nim-i-th. Compare, on the other hand, the Lettish imperatives like darrait, "do ye," contrasted with darrat, "ye do" (§. 682.). Dais, "give thou," daiti, "give ye" (in Old Prussian), contrasted with dase, "thou givest," dahi,

* Respecting the length of the a, see §. 434.
† With regard to the suppression of the i of bairau, compare, in Gothic, Grimm's third class of the weak conjugation, in which the i of the conjunctional character ai (= Sanskrit ψι α, Latin ê) is everywhere lost, where a final nasal, or one standing before a consonant, follows, or ought to follow; thus, first person singular, haba for habai, Old High German habém; plural, habam for habaim, Old High German habëmes; third person plural, haband for habaind, Old High German habënt; in opposition to habais, habarith, &c.
"ye give," furnish, as it were, a commentary on the relation of the Latin dēs, dētis, to dās, datis, as the combination of a + i, which is not perceived in the Latin e, is evident in the Old Prussian. More usually, however, the Old Prussian exhibits, in the indicative, an e or i as the conjunctive vowel, and in the imperative the diphthong ei; e.g. dereis, "see thou" = δέρκοις, idētī " esset"* = ἔδοιτε, ēditis, ἔχοιτα adỵtα.
The two moods, however, do not everywhere agree, since, e.g., tickinnaiti, "make ye" (Katech. p. 54), does not answer to tickinnimai, "we make" (l. c. p. 5), but leads us to expect instead of it tickinnamai. The simple i, also, or, in its place, y, is found in Old Prussian imperatives, as, mylis, "love thou," endiris, "regard thou."

696. The Old Sclavonic has retained only [G. Ed. p. 951.] the last element of the original diphthong ai in the second and third person singular in its imperative in the regular conjugation, which, as has been before shewn, corresponds partly to the Sanskrit first class with a annexed (§. 499.), partly to the fourth in ь иа (§. 500), partly to the tenth in ай ау (§. 505); as, бежи веги, "ride," and "let him ride," corresponds to the Sanskrit vahēs, vahēt (§. 433), Latin vehēs, vehēt, and vehās, vehat, Gothic vigais, vigai, Greek ἔχωις, ἔχοι. In the dual and plural, however, where the diphthong is protected by the following personal termination, бе je (from e with y prefixed, §. 255. n.) corresponds to the Indo-Roman ē, Gothic ai, and Greek oi; thus, бежемы вегеми = вехем вехêma, вехêmus, вехêmus, вехайма, ἔχωμεν; беже веге = вехе vahêta, vehētis, vehātis, vēgaith, i̯χοτε; dual бежета вегета = вехетам vahētam, вехетáм vahētam, ἔχοτα, ἔχοταν, vēgaits.

697. Among the other Sclavonic languages, the Carniolan especially deserves, with respect to the mood under

* Ist, "he eats;" euphonic for idt, corresponds to the Latin est.
† This represents the third person also, see §. 470.
discussion, a closer consideration, as its imperative in those verbs which have a as the class syllable is distinguished from the present indicative by the placing of a y (=i) beside the a; so that thus ay is opposed to the Sankrit ē=a + i of the potential, to the Gothic ai of the subjunctive, and to the Latin ē of the subjunctive and future. The singular, which, in Carniolan also, in advantageous contrast with the other Slavonic dialects, has a first person, ends in the three persons in ay, since the pronominal consonants, which, from the most ancient period, have stood at the end of words, must give place according to the rule for the extirpation of final consonants, which extends to all the Slavonic idioms.

[G. Ed. p. 952.] (§. 255. l); hence, dél-ay, “let me work,” “work thou,” “let him work,” for dél-ay-m, dél-ay-s, dél-ay-t, opposed to the indicative dél-a-m (from dél-a-mi), dél-a-sh (from dél-a-shi), dél-a (from dél-a-ti), and, in accordance with Gothic forms like bair-ai-s, bair-ai, Sanskrit like bharēs, bharēt, Latin like amēm, amēs, amet, vehēs, vehēt Greek like φέρομι, φέροις, φέροι. In the dual dél-ay-wu answers to the indicative dél-a-wa, in the most perfect accordance with the Gothic bairaiva and Sanskrit bharēva; in the second person dual, dél-ay-ta has the same relation to the indicative dél-a-ta, that, in Gothic, bair-ai-ts, “feratis,” has to bair-a-ts “feritis;” and, in the plural, dél-ay-mo is to dél-a-mo as, in Gothic, bair-ai-ma to bair-a-m, or, in Greek, φέρ-οι-μεν to φέρ-οι-τε; in the second person, dél-ay-te bears the same relation to dél-a-te that, in Gothic, bair-ai-th has to that which we must presuppose as the original form of the indicative bair-a-th, whence the corruption bair-i-th: hence the Old High German ber-t-t (from ber-ai-t), contrasted with its indicative ber-a-t, is better compared. The third person dual and plural is wanting in the Carniolan imperative, and is expressed by a periphrasis of the indicative with the conjunction nay; thus, nay délata, nay délato.
698. The analogy, however, of the Carniolan forms like del-ay-mo, "let us work," with the Gothic like bair-ai-ma and Sanskrit like bhar-é-ma, must not be so far extended as to identify the vowel of derivation of verbs like del-a-m with the conjunctive vowel of the Sanskrit first and sixth class, and with that of the Gothic strong verbs. I rather see in del-a-m, as in the Polish first conjugation (czyt-a-m, "I read," czyt-ay, "read thou," czyt-ay-my, "let us read," ) the Sanskrit tenth class, the character of which, aya, has separated into various forms in the Slavonic idioms as in Latin and the German weak conjugation. The Carniolan dé-a-m and Polish czyt-a-m are brought much nearer to the Sanskrit like chint-ayd-mi, "I think," through the Russian sister forms: Åibaio dyé-layû. чимаю chitayû (from dyél-ayo-m, chit-áyo-m; see §. 255. g.). In the third person plural the Carniolan délya and Polish czytayq approach nearer to the Sanskrit chint-aya-nti: on the other hand the Carniolan yedó, "they eat," corresponds to the Sanskrit adanti, from the root ad, [G. Ed. p. 958.]

* I now, also, refer Dobrowsky's first Conjugation in Old Sclavonic, (contrary to §. 500.), at least principally, to the Sanskrit tenth class; so that I assume the suppression of the first a of the character aya, as in Grimm's first conjugation of the weak form, which, by this loss, has become similar to the Sanskrit fourth class (see §. 1093. 6.). The Old Sclavonic, however, has also not unfrequently retained the first a of the character aya; as in padaayû, "I fall," chitayû, "I read" (Dobr. 522.). In some roots ending with a vowel the y may be a euphonic addition, and ξnayû, "I know" (Sanskrit jnâ, "to know"), piyû, "I drink" (Sanskrit pâ, "to drink"), may belong neither to the Sanskrit fourth nor to the tenth class, but to the first, with the insertion of a y between the root and the conjunctive vowel (compare §. 43.). I take this opportunity to remark further, that in §. 506. Mielke's fourth conjugation in Lithuanian has remained by mistake unnoticed. It includes but very few words, but belongs, in like manner, to the Sanskrit tenth class, and exhibits the character of that class, aya, clearly in its preterites, as yêskóyau (yêsk-óya-u). In the present, together with yêszkau is found, also, the form yêstkóyu.
the d of which in Carniolan is retained unchanged only in the third person plural, but before t has been changed to s, and elsewhere is dropped: thus yes-te, "ye eat," as in Latin es-tis, for the Sanskrit at-tha; yes-ta, "ye two eat," "they two eat," for जयप at-thus, जात्र at-tas. In the imperative, yéy for yédy answers to the Sanskrit adyátam, adyána, adyátt; dual yéyva, yéyta=adyáva, adyátam; plural yéymo, yéythe, for adyáma, adyáta.

699. The Zend appears to us, in its potential of the first conjugation, to use the expression, in a half Greek half Indo-Roman dress, since it exhibits the primitive diphthong ai at one time in the shape of òi, at another in that of è

[G. Ed. p. 954.] (§. 33.), to which latter, however, according to §. 28., another a is prefixed. Thus मयज्या बारबिः agrees admirably with φέροις, and मोयज्या बारोिः with φέροις(τ): on the other hand, in the middle voice the third person मयज्या बाराेता agrees better with the Sanskrit bharēta, and, after withdrawing the middle a, with the Latin feret, than with φέρορς. The first and second persons plural active in the first conjugation I am unable to quote, but I have no doubt that here again मयज्या बारेमा, मोयज्या बारेता, run parallel to the Sanskrit bharēma, bharēta, and Latin ferēmus, ferētis, and that we should not look here for the more Greek form barōima, barōita. For I imagine I have found that in selecting between òi and æ the Zend is guided by what follows the diphthong, according as it is a final consonant, or one accompanied by a vowel. How much the selection falls upon òi, in the former position, to the rejection of æ, is seen from this, that bases in i in the genitive and ablative regularly exhibit the forms òis and òit, answering to the Sanskrit ēś.* Through this, therefore, we may explain

* Remark, also, the frequently-occurring नोिः not, "not," =Sanskrit nēt.
the misrelation in form between the middle *buidhyōmaidhi* and the active *bardīt*, in the third person singular of the potential. But when we find in the first person plural middle the form *būidhyōmaidhē* "videamus" = Sanskrit युध्येमाहि, "sciamus,"

here the exceedingly broad termination, which in the lithographed Codex is even separated from the preceding part of the word by a point, may have the effect of a distinct word; and thus it may be observed, that in the final sound, also, the diphthong ṥi is admissible, and in [G. Ed. p. 955.]

this position is especially favored by a preceding y: hence ṣy, "which" (ṣi) = ṣ ye, पुढ्योधिमाहि, "in medio" (§ 196) = मयेद midhyē; but also पो मोि, "to me," अप toि and थवो thwē, "to thee," अषि hōi, "to him," with अ मे, न ते, अतः thwē, अषि hē. I would, therefore, not deduce from *būidhyōmaidhē* forms like *bardīmaidhē*, still less an active *bardīma*; for in both forms the y, which favors the ṣi, is deficient, and in the latter, also, the breadth of termination giving the appearance of a separate word, for which reason, in the third person singular, not *būidhyōita* but *būidhyaēta* answers to the *būidhyōmaidhē* which has been mentioned (Vend. S. p. 45).

700. In the third person plural the old a of the original diphthong ai has been retained unaltered, but the i has, on account of the following vowel of the termination, passed into its corresponding semivowel y; and thus, पुढ्याणम बरयें answers to the Greek φέρειν; and thus, for the one ai of the Greek optative in Zend, we have, according to the quality of the termination following, three forms, viz. ṣi, aē, and ay. Frequently, however, as the third person plural in the mood under discussion of the first active form can be quoted, the first person singular is,

---

* Vend. S., p. 45, twice; once, erroneously, *būidhyōmaidhē*; and once, *būidhyōmaidē*.
on the contrary, of extremely rare occurrence, though it ought properly to be our point of starting. It must excite our curiosity to learn whether it resembles more the ἐπείν which is to be presupposed in Greek, and which, §. 689, we have found supported by τρέφουν, or rather Latin forms like amem, or Sanskrit as bharē-y-am (§. 43.). As in the third person plural barayēn answers to the Sanskrit bharē-y-us (from bharē-y-ant), so in the first person singular bara-y-ēm might be expected for bharēyam. As, however, in Zend, if a y precedes the termination ēm, the ē is regularly suppressed, after which the semivowel becomes a vowel, [G. Ed. p. 956.] so might baraēm* or bardim be anticipated: neither of these forms, however, occurs, but one with the personal character suppressed, and otherwise corresponding to the second person मष्ट्यं bardoś, and to the third मष्ट्यं bardoī, if the मष्ट्यं nēmōi, which twice occurs Vend. S., p. 359, is the correct reading; and there मष्ट्यं मष्ट्यं kaim nēmōi zaim (which Anquetil translates "quelle terre invoquerai-je") really means literally (as in all probability it does) "quaem invocem terram?"† After this follows मष्ट्यं मष्ट्यं kuthra nēmōi ayēni, &c., according to Anquetil "quelle prière choisirai-je," perhaps literally "whither shall I go (मष्ट्यं ayēni = जयदि ayēni), that I may adore?" We look with eagerness for the light which may be thrown on this passage by the aid of Neriosengh's Sanskrit translation. Among the other potentials of the first conjugation which occur in the Vend. S., we may here further mention the frequently-occurring upa-zōī, "he may beat," from the root zan = Sanskrit जन

* According to the analogy of vaēn, "we," for the Sanskrit vayam; for after rejecting the a preceding the m the preceding ay must be melted down to ē, and, according to §. 28, an a must be prefixed to the ē.

† Compare with nēmōi the Sanskrit namas, "adoration," from the root nam.
han, which, after rejecting the n of the preceding radical
vowel, is treated as though it were the annexed vowel of
the first class; in which respect may be observed what has
been before remarked regarding the Sanskrit root स्था
sthā (§. 508.). And अन्नोम्यते ज्ञेरेनाल्ला, "he may
strew" (Vend. S. p. 377) deserves special notice, since in
this word the class syllable न (ninth class), after abbre-
viating the a, follows the analogy of the short a of the
four classes of the first conjugation; and thus, in this
respect, अन्नोम्यते ज्ञेरेनाल्ला, after with-
drawing the middle final a, becomes similar to the Latin
future sternet (§. 496.).

701. In the second conjugation the Zend answers in its
potential tolerably well to the Sanskrit, with the exception
of the third person plural, in which the termination us,
mentioned in §. 462., does not occur; and also in the middle
the somewhat enigmatical termination ran (§. 613.) is repre-
sented by a form which corresponds better to the general
principle for the designation of the person, regarding
which we shall treat hereafter. In the first person sin-
gular of the active, according to §. 61., yaṁm corresponds to
the Sanskrit यद्म and Greek ἦν; e.g. the daidhyānm,
"I may place, make," already mentioned above (§. 442. 5.)
corresponds to the Sanskrit दाधयाम दाधयाम and Greek
τιθεῖν. In the second person, according to §. 568., यद्य is found for यत् यद्, ἦς; e.g. यद्युद्धा यद्युद्धा fra-mruydo
"dicta" = πρα-βροῦδας (Vend. S. p. 451); and in the
third, यद्यत् यद्यत् = यद्यत् यद्यत्, ἦς(τ), e.g. यद्यत् यद्यत् kērōnyat,
"faciat" (Vend. S. p. 457) = कृत्यत् kriṇuyat of the Vēda
dialect (p. 126 G. ed.). I am unable to quote the plural in
the proper potential, though I can do so in the preceptive,
which has completely the same signification, and which
occurs far more frequently in Zend than in Sanskrit, and
is distinguished from the potential only by the removal of
the class characteristics, so that the form of the potential
may be safely inferred from the precative. In the first person plural yāma stands for the Sanskrit yātsa and Greek ημευ, e.g. δοξέω buyāma* = Sanskrit bhūyātsa (Vend. S. p. 312); and hence I deduce the potential daidhya-yāma from the above-mentioned daidhyayām. In the second person, yata (with the vowel of the modal character shortened) stands for the Sanskrit yāsta and Greek ητε; [G. Ed. p. 958.] e.g. δοξέω buyata, "sitis,"† = भूस्त bhūyāsta; दौखर ज्ञयतα "detis," † = दौखर ḍē-यास्तα, ṣoŋre. Hence I deduce, in the potential, the form daidhyata=Sanskrit dadhyāta, Greek ḍoŋre. Here the shortening of the syllable yā is remarkable in comparison with the length of quantity preserved before the termination ma of the first person; and as this contrast can hardly be fortuitous, we must perhaps assume that the termination ta, on account of the mute with which it begins, is sustained with more difficulty by the language than the termination ma, which begins with one of the lightest consonants; and hence occasion has arisen for weakening the preceding syllable, in the sense of § 480.

702. In the third person plural the combination of the modal syllable yā with the personal termination en, originally an, produces the form yāin for yān, according to the analogy of the first person singular in yaín for yām. Before the final nasal, therefore, the latter half of the long d=a+a has been weakened to the nasal sound of the Sanskrit Anuswāra. We may take as an example निदिथयायिन nidithyāyin, "they should lay down" (Vend. S. pp. 203, 204), for which I should have anticipated nidaithyāyin, as, in the third person singular

* The root ḍā shortens its vowel in the precative, compare Burnouf’s Yaçaṇa, Note S., p. 152.
† Vend. S., pp. 115, 457, 459, and, according to Burnouf’s Yaçaṇa, Note S., p. 152, in the still unedited part, p. 556.
†† According to Burnouf, i.e., in the still unedited part of the Vend. S., pp. 542, 543, 548.
of the middle, \textit{paiti ni-daitithita}, "he may lay down" (Vend. S. p. 282, ll. 2, 7, 12, 17), is found from the root \textit{dath}, from \textit{dā} extended by the affix of a \textit{th} (see p. 112), which, through the influence of the \textit{y} following, has received the affix of an \textit{i}, which in \textit{ni-dityaína} above has remained alone. From the root \textit{dā}, "to give," we should anticipate \textit{dāyaín}, or perhaps, [G. Ed. p. 959.] with the radical vowel shortened, \textit{dayain}, which comes very near to the Greek \textit{doíev}, while the Sanskrit \textit{dēyās}sus (from \textit{dēyā sanctioned}) agrees more with \textit{doíσαv}. The Sanskrit annexes, as has been already remarked, in its preceptive the verb substantive to the root, with the exception of the second and third person singular of the active, in which properly \textit{dēyās}, \textit{dēyāst}, would be required, which, in the present state of the language, according to a strict law of sound (§. 94.), is impossible, and the language has therefore preferred rather to drop the auxiliary verb than the personal character; thus, \textit{dēyās}, \textit{dēyāt}, answering to the Zend \textit{dāydo}, \textit{dāyāt}. It is, however, very worthy of remark, that the Zend abstains entirely from employing the verb substantive, and thus sides completely with the Greek, only that the latter agrees in \textit{doíσαv} with the Sanskrit, and in \textit{doíev} with the Zend.

703. In the middle voice, also, the Zend preceptive abstains from annexing the verb substantive; and on the contrary, according to the principle which the Sanskrit follows in the potential (§. 673.), contracts the syllable \textit{yāt} to \textit{i}, and in the plural, at least in the third person, to short \textit{i}. While, therefore, the Sanskrit and Lithuanian make common cause through forms like \textit{dā-stō-dhwam}, \textit{dā-ki-te} ("detis," "date"), the previously-mentioned Zend form \textit{paiti-ni-daitithita} ranks with the Greek \textit{beíto}, since in both a simple \textit{i} sound is combined with the root. I view the form \textit{yadsh-daitithita},* which

* The last portion of this verb is radically identical with the just-mentioned \textit{paiti ni-daitithita} : see §. 637.
often occurs in the Eighth Fargard, as of more importance it is everywhere regarded by Anquetil as singular, and we should be the more easily led to suppose him in the right, as the Sanskrit gives us no direct information regarding this

[G. Ed. p. 960.] form; and, in fact, it has more the appearance of a singular than a plural, and if once recognised as a preative, would rather lead us to the Greek θεῖτο than to θεῖντο. The Sanskrit supplies us with no direct information regarding the form साधारणं जैकडाणम्; for, according to the theory of Sanskrit, we must have expected हिरण (from सिरण), instead of the termination इथा, and हिस्ता for the above-mentioned singular इता. But as the Zend pre-cative, in the active, renounces the verb substantive, we may be prepared for the like in the middle; and as, in the third person singular in the potential, इता is formed from यत्त, a similar इता in the preative cannot surprise us. It is clear, however, that दाईकडाण is a preative, and not a potential,* since the root दाल, which is extended from दा, in its conjugation follows the first class, and not the second, and therefore, in the potential, forms दाधाला, and not दाईकडाण. The third person plural, दाईकडाण, however, answers neither to the Sanskrit potentials middle like दाधिरण, तिस्तेिन्तो, nor to the precatives like द्हासिरण, θεῖντο; but perhaps to the universal principle of formation of the third person plural middle, and, in particular, to that form which, according to §. 459., rejects the n belonging to the plural. Thus, माक्ष्मम दाईकडाण, “they should lay,” answers to the Sanskrit forms like दाधाला, “they lay,” and Ionic like δίδωσεν, τίθέασα. As this rejection of the n in the Sanskrit middle special tenses has become the rule of the whole class of the second conjugation, and the preative agrees with the potential of the second

* I retain the terms derived from the Sanskrit, though it is unsuitable to distinguish various forms of one and the same mood, as if they were of different moods.
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class, we are the less surprised at finding the Zend daithita
deficient in the n. This daithita, however, [G. Ed. p. 61.]
appears to me to be a contraction of daith-yata, since the
modal element, which we have seen above (§ 702.), in the
singular daithita, in the form of an i, must in the plural be-
come y before the termination ata, which the Sanskrit requires
in the secondary forms: from yata, however, by casting out
the a, would easily be formed ita (compare p. 780 G. ed.).
But if the termination of the third person plural had always
been ita, we should be unable to perceive any reason why
the modal vowel should be long in the singular and short
in the plural before the same termination.

"Remark.—It remains further to be shewn that the word
$\text{yaosht-daithita}$, which has hitherto appeared isolated, but which occurs perhaps seven times in the Eighth
Fargard of the Vendidad, is (in spite of Anquetil's or his.
Parsi teacher's opinion that it is a singular) actually a
plural. We read in V. S. pp. 266, &c., \text{\textit{pari-irixtahto}}
\text{mashy} & \text{\textbar{\textit{mazda}}}.
\text{\textit{paiti avatha yadsltdayaAn.}}

According to Anquetil (II. p. 336), "L'homme sur le quel on a porté quelque chose du
cadavre d'un chien ou de celui d'un homme, est il pur?
Ormuzd repondit, il est pur; comment? Lorsque (le mort)
a été regardé par le chien qui mange les corps, ou par l'oiseau
qui mange les corps. Il se lavera ensuite le corps avec de l'urine de boeuf, avec de l'eau, et il sera pur." So much is certain, that mention is here made, not of one man, but of several (tā nara ya, "those men, who," see §. 231.), and that yaōsh-dayain anhēn signifies, not "he will be pure," but "they are purified," or "they become purified." Hence, it is self-evident that yaōshdaiithita, also, must be a plural. I translate literally, "How do these men become (are) purified who are touched by the carcase † either of a dead dog or of a man? To this Ormuzd said, They become purified where, or how (by what means?) so that yēva would stand for yē-va = Sanskrit येन येवा वद? "If that carcase touches (?), of a body-devouring dog or of a body-devouring bird, then they (those men) should purify their bodies with cow urine and with water: so (avatha)

* It may here be added to what has been remarked in §. 637, regarding the expression yaōshdayain that it might also be the third person plural of the precative, the dā of the root dā, "to make," being shortened, and the analogy of būyain, "they may be," being followed (see §. 702. and Burnouf's Yaça, Note S., p. 152). The placing together of two verbs in the third person plural would consequently rest on a syntactical peculiarity, and yaōshdayain a. hēn, "they are purified," would literally signify "they are (that) they purify." The passive signification would be expressed by a periphrasis, in which the verb substantive would be combined with the active expression of the attributive verb in the precative. To this opinion I give the preference above that delivered in §. 637.; and I remind the reader, that, in Arabic, the imperfect is expressed by a circumlocution, in which the preterite of the verb substantive is prefixed to the present of the attributive verb, without the intervention of a conjunction; e.g. kān जेलसे kana yajliyu, "he sate," properly "he was, he sits," for "he was, that he sits." At the end of the passage quoted above yaōshdayaṁ (to which the preposition paiti Sanskrit prati, belongs) is indisputably the precative.

† I will not affirm that ava-bērēta (from bērēta, "borne," in combination with the preposition ava) here signifies "touchd"; but hitherto I have not discovered any more suitable meaning for the whole sense.
must they purify them." At p. 268, L. 9, &c., we read

from this he, "swi," we see that the Zend reflexive, like the kindred Latin, German, Lithuanian, and Sclavonic, unites with the form of the singular the meanings of the plural numbers.

[From this we see that the Zend reflexive, like the kindred Latin, German, Lithuanian, and Sclavonic, unites with the form of the singular the meanings of the plural numbers.]
same mood, as the precative and potential have the same relation to one another, that, in Greek, the aorist and the present optative have. As regards the form *kērēndita*, we should perhaps, if the reading is correct, consider the *δ* to be the Guna of the class-syllable; then the remaining *ita* would rest on the same principle as the termination of *yadshdaithita*. We might, however, explain *kērēnditu* also in this way, that the *u* of the class-syllable *nu* is replaced by *a*, and the verb in this way brought into the first conjugation: but I see less probability in this view of the matter; for then the frequently-occurring *barayēn*, “they may carry,” must, in the middle, be [G. Ed. p. 964.] *barōita*, which, as long as such forms are not traced back with certainty, I do not believe, as I should rather conjecture *barayanta*. In respect to syntax, the use of the precative and potential in the passage in question is to be noticed in a conditional conclusion; while, according to the method of other languages, the indicative would be looked for. With regard to syntax I will here further mention, that in another passage of the Vendidad (in Olshausen, p. 1) the potential follows *yēdhi*, “if,” in the sense of the pluperfect of the subjunctive—*yēdhi nōt daitdhyānīm*, “If I had not made;” on the other hand, the present after *yēzī* is generally expressed by the mood called *Lēt*, which corresponds to the Greek subjunctive. It need not surprise us that each individual language, in the syntactical application of its moods, follows its own course in certain points: the grammatical identity of forms in the different languages is not, however, destroyed by such syntactical discrepancy.

704. In a still unedited portion of the *Zend-Avesta* occurs the form $<2J%Ajw^$ *dayadhwēm*, “ye may give,” which Burnouf (Yaçaña, Note D. p. 38), as it appears, regards as an imperative, and renders by *donnez*. In order, however, to regard *dayadhwēm* as the imperative, we must be able to prove that the root *dd*, in *Zend*, is inflected according to the fourth class, of which I entertain
doubts. I look upon $\text{द्याय्यते }$ as the second person plural of the precative middle, and, as such, there is nothing surprising in it (after our having already seen that the Zend precative, in both active forms, abstains from annexing the verb substantive), except that the modal character $yd$ is not contracted, as in the third person singular middle, and in all persons in the Sanskrit, to $t$, but has merely shortened its $d$, as in the corresponding person of the active, to which Burnouf has shewn the form $dāyata$ belongs. The middle $dayadhwem$ has shortened the vowel of the root, on account, as it appears, of the greater weight of the termination; and in this respect, therefore, $da-yā-dhwem$ has the same relation to $dā-ya-ta$, that, in Greek, $dīdoμα$ has to $dīdoμυ$.

705. In the Sanskrit and Zend potential [G. Ed. p. 965.] there is no distinction of tenses, except that, as has been before observed, the precative stands in the same relation to it $t$ in Greek, the optative of the second aorist has to that of the present. $dě-yās$, $dě-yāt$, for $dā-yās$, $dā-yāt$ have the same relation to $adās$, $adāt$, that, in Greek, $dōις$, $dōι$ (for $dōις$, $dōι$), have to $εδος$, $εδω$. For precatives like $budhyās$, $budhyāt$, there are no corresponding indicative forms, as the fifth formation of the Sanskrit aorist is limited to roots terminating with a vowel (see §. 573.): it may, however, originally have occurred also in roots ending with a consonant; so that there would have existed multiform preterites like $abudh-am$, $ab hut$ (for $abhub-s$), $ab hut$ (for $ab hut-t$), $abudhma$, &c., to which belong precatives like $budh-yās am$. Vēdic forms like $vidēyam$, "sciam," $sākēyam$, "possim," $gamēyam$, "eam," $vōchēma$, "dicamus" (Pāṇini, III. 1. 86.), do not need to be regarded as potentials of the first class, to which the roots of these forms do not belong; but they are, as it were, the prototypes of Greek aorists of the optative mood, like $τόπομυ$, and must be regarded as derivatives of the aorists of the sixth formation ($avidam$, 
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asakam, agamam, avócham), the conjunctive vowel of which has combined with the modal vowel i; just as the Greek o of τóποιμυ has united the conjunctive vowel of ἔτυποσ-ον (which is interchanged in the indicative with e) with the modal vowel. In proof of the correctness of this opinion may be particularly adduced the above-mentioned vóchêma, "dicamus"; for there is no root vóch, which, if it existed, could be assigned to the first class, from which might be formed vóchêma, according to the analogy of tarpêma, τέρπομεν; there is, indeed, an aorist avócham, which we have explained above as a reduplicate form from a-va-ucham (for a-vavacham).

[G. Ed. p. 966.] 706. In the Vêda dialect also traces exist of modal forms, which exhibit the structure of the Greek optative of the first aorist. As example, taruśhêma is adduced, according to sense = तरेम tarêma, "transgrediamur" (Pâñini, III. 1. 85.), but, according to form, a derivative from an indicative aorist like adik-sham, δειεξα (§. 555.), only not with the direct adjunction of the auxiliary verb, but with the insertion of a conjunctive vowel u. But this तरुपःṃ taruśhêma can hardly be an isolated attempt of the language at a modal formation, which now appears to us abnormal; but it is probable, rather, that, in an earlier state of the language, which has in this point been transmitted to us more correctly by the Greek, these forms extended to all aorists of the second formation (§. 551.). We may suppose, therefore, that, in an earlier period of the language, a precative of adikšham existed, viz. dik-šêyam, plural, dik-shêma=δειξαμι, δειξαμεν, in which the modal element yd, contracted to i, became a diphthong with the preceding vowel, in the same manner as above in bhar-δ-y-am, bhar-δ-ma, φέρ-οι-μι, φέρ-οι-μεν.

707. In Latin, the imperfects of the subjunctive admit of comparison with the principle of formation of Greek aorists like δειξαμεν, and Sanskrit like the presupposed
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dik-ṣhaima, and the Vedic taruṣhēma. In fact, sta-rēmus is surprisingly similar to the Greek σταρέμυς, in so far as its ῥ, like that of eram, is a corruption of s, and its ἑ, like that of amēmus, legēmus, a contraction of ai. As, however, sta-bam is a new compound, I cannot but recognise in its subjunctive, also, only a new formation; and in this respect I adhere to the opinion, which I have already expressed in my System of Conjugation (p. 98). A subjunctive sta-bem from sta-baim would be in conformity with the indicative sta-bam, and sta-ram from sta-eram would be analogous as an indicative to sta-rem. The language, however, divides [G. Ed. p. 967.] the two roots of to be at its disposal between the indicative and subjunctive, and thus brings sta-bam and sta-rem into a certain degree of false relation, where it appears as if the ῥ of starem had a share in the expression of the modal relation, which is nevertheless confined solely to the i contained in the diphthong ἑ. It will be readily admitted that possem (from potsem) contains the combination of the verb substantive with pot, just as much as pos-sum and pot-eram. But if pos-sem is a new and genuine Latin formation, the es-sem, “I would eat,” which is analogous to it, from ed-sem, is so also; and with this agrees, too, the obsolete fac-sem, which, in form at least, is an imperfect, as fac-sim is a present; for if these forms had arisen from the perfect feci, they would be fexem, fexim. While then, after consonants, the old s is either retained or assimilated to a preceding ῥ or l (fer-rem, vel-lem), between two vowels it has passed into ῥ; and this is usually the case, as the imperfect preserves the class-syllable; thus, leg-e-rem, dic-e-rem (from leg-i-rem, dic-i-rem, see §. 554.). But if the imperfect subjunctive were, in its origin, connected with the Greek optative aorist, then for dic-e-rem we should anticipate dixem = ἔλεγαμυ. The forms es-sem (“I would eat”) and fer-rem are established by the circumstance that these verbs, as is shewn by their affinity with the Sanskrit, dis-
tinctly belong to the conjugation without the conjunctive vowel; so that *es-sem* answers to *ē-s, es-t, es-tis*= Sanskrit *at-si, at-ti, at-tha*; *fer-rem* to *fer-s, fer-t, fer-tis*= Sanskrit *bihhar-ši, bibhar-ti, bibhṛi-tha*. Hence we see that it is in no way admissible to derive *fer-rem* from *fer-e-rem*, by rejecting an *e*. We should rather be compelled to explain

[G. Ed. p. 968.] *fer-e-rem*, if this form existed, by including it in the principal conjugation with the conjunctive vowel, as from *es-sem* has been developed *ed-e-rem*.

708. But how stands it with *es-sem*, "I would be," for which we should have conjectured *erem*, corresponding with the indicative *eram*? But *eram* stands for *esam*= Sanskrit *dsam* (§ 532.); and from this primitive form *esam* has arisen the form *esem* (from *esēm*), through the com-
mixture of the modal *i*, which is contracted with *a* to *ē*, according to the same principle by which *amem* has been formed from the theme *ama*. Were *esem* once formed from *esam*, then, in the course of time, the indicative parent form may have followed its disposition to change the *s*, on account of its position between two vowels, into *r*, without there being hence a necessity that the derivative form *esem*, also, should follow this impulse; for it is not a general rule in Latin that every *s* between two vowels must be changed into *r*. Through the firm reten-
tion, therefore, by the subjunctive, of the old, and subse-
quently doubled sibilant *eram* and *esem, essem*, stand in the same opposition as, conversely, in Old High German, *was*, "I was," does to *wāri*, "I would be," in which the weak-
ening of the *s* to *r* has its foundation in the increase of syllables (see § 612. p. 660 G. ed.) The doubling of the *s* in *essem* I believe may be explained according to the same principle by which, in Greek, in the epic language, the weakest consonants (the liquids and *σ*)—occasionally, and under certain circumstances, *ρ*—are, in the common dialect, regularly doubled. The Sanskrit doubles a final *n*
after a short vowel, in case the word following begins with a vowel. If, then, which I believe to be the case, the doubling of the s in the Latin *esse*, and in the infinitive *esse*, is likewise purely of a euphonic nature, it may be compared especially with Greek aorists like ἔτελεσσα, since the σσ of these tenses likewise belong to the [G. Ed. p. 969.] verb substantive: observe, also, the Lithuanian *ēssie*, “if he be” (§. 683.). Regarding ἔσσομα, see §. 655. But should the double s in *essem* have its foundation in etymology, which I do not believe, then it must be assumed, that when the *esem*, which arose from *esam*, had firmly attached itself to attributive verbs in the abbreviated form of *sem*, or, more generally, *rem*, and in this position was no longer recognised for what it really is, so that the whole *se, re*, was considered as the modal exponent, then the root *es* combined with itself; according to which, *ensem* would properly mean “I would be be,” in analogy with *es-sem*, “I would eat,” and *pos-sem*, “I would be able.” And the analogy of *es-sem*, “I would eat,” and *possem*, “I would be able,” as also that of *ferrem* and *vellum*, might have so far operated on *essem*, “I would be,” that, according to their example, without the languages furnishing any particular reason for it, the consonant preceding the e was doubled. Be this as it may, *essem*, and the *esem* preceding it, remain in so far a new formation, as in the Sanskrit no mood whatever proceeds from the imperfect, any more than in Greek. The Latin subjunctive, therefore, of the imperfect meets with its nearest point of comparison only in the Greek optative aorist; since *esem* (*eram*) is produced from *esam*, just as *τυφυμα* from ἔτυφα.

709. No trace of the production of moods can be shewn to attach to the Sanskrit reduplicate preterite or perfect.*

* I cannot agree with Westergaard in regarding Vēdic forms like *satriyāt*
[G. Ed. p. 970.] As, however, the potential of the second and sixth aorist formation in the Vēda-dialect is, as it were in its moment of extinction, still to be met with in its remnants as tarushēma, gamēyam, vōchēyam (§. 705.), it might be assumed that the extirpation of the moods, which have arisen from the reduplicate preterite, only made its appearance somewhat earlier, or that the relics of them, which have remained to the period when the Vēdas were composed, may be lost to us, together with the memorials in which they occurred. But if there existed a potential of the perfect, it is a question whether the conjunctive vowel $a$ (see §. 614.) was retained before the modal element or not? In the former case, forms like tu-tu$p^\tilde{y}$-am, tu$tуп_{e}$-s, tu$tуп_{e}$-l, would have arisen, to which would correspond the Greek τετύφοιμι (from τετύφοικ, see §. 689.), τετύφος, τετύφοι (whence might be expected, also, τετύφαιμι, &c.): in the latter case, forms like tu$tуп_{y}$-am would have existed, as prototypes of the Gothic subjunctives of the preterite like haitai$tυ$, "I might be called," or with the loss of reduplication, as bund$tυ$, "I might bind," which would lead us to expect Greek forms like τετυφίν, which must afterwards have been introduced into the ω conjugation. The close coincidence of the Greek and German makes the origin of such modal forms in the time of the unity of language very

*sasrijyāt* as potentials of the perfect, but of the intensive (comp. §. 515.), which, in the Vēda-dialect, presents several deviations from the classical language, and in roots with middle ū (from *ar*) exhibits in the syllable of repetition $a$, more frequently $ō$, and also, in conformity with the common dialect, *ar*. Thus vā$vридhāti* (Rig V. 33. 1.) is the *Lōt* of the intensive, and vā$vридhaswa* (Rig V. 31. 18.) its imperative middle. Westergaard also refers the participle present middle *tātrī. hāna*, "thirsting" (Rig V. 31. 7.) to the intensive, though it might be ascribed to the perfect with the same justice as *sasrijyāt* and vā$vридhāna*. 
probable; the Gothic forms, also, like haihaityau, are too classical in their appearance to allow of our ascribing to them a comparatively recent origin. But if, nevertheless, they are specially German, and the Greek, [G. Ed. p. 971.] confessedly rare, like τευθόμυ, are specially Greek, then the two sister languages have, in fortuitous coincidence, only accorded a wider extension to a principle of modal production, which already existed in the period of their unity with the Sanskrit and Zend.

710. Latin perfect subjunctives like amave-rim, from ama-vi-sim, are undoubtedly new productions, viz. the combination of the base of the perfect with sim, “I may be,” the s of which, in its position between two vowels, has been corrupted to r; and, on account of this r, the i of amavi, amavi-sti, has been corrupted to e (compare p. 967 G. ed.). We might also, if necessitated, divide thus, amav-erim,* as sim stands for esim, like sum for esum. But in composition there was still more reason to withdraw the e of esim, than in the uncompounded state; and the corruption of the i to e before an r is too much in rule not to admit of it here.

711. We here give a general view of the points of comparison, which have been obtained in treating of the Sanskrit and Zend potential and preceptive, and of the moods corresponding to them of the European sister languages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SANSKRIT</th>
<th>ZEND</th>
<th>GREEK</th>
<th>LATIN</th>
<th>LITH.</th>
<th>OLD SCLAV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>dadyam,¹</td>
<td>daidhyaim,²</td>
<td>δίδοιν,</td>
<td>duim³</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dadyas,</td>
<td>daidhydo,</td>
<td>δίδοις,</td>
<td>dnis,</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>duschdy⁴</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dadyas</td>
<td>daidhydt,</td>
<td>δίδοι,</td>
<td>duit,</td>
<td>dâdie,⁵</td>
<td>duschdy⁴</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dadyt,</td>
<td>daidhyt,</td>
<td>δίδοιτο</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* See in my System of Conjugation, p. 100.
### 944 POTENTIAL, OPTATIVE, AND SUBJUNCTIVE.

[G. Ed. p. 972.]

**DUAL.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>dadyāva,</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>daschdyva,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dadyātām,</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>dīdoītov,</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>daschdyta,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dadyātām</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>dīdoītyn,</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>daschdyta,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PLURAL.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>dadyāma,</td>
<td>daidhyāma,</td>
<td>ḍīdoīnev,</td>
<td>duīmus,</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>daschdymy,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dadyāta,</td>
<td>daidhyata,</td>
<td>ḍīdoīnte,</td>
<td>duīlis,</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>daschdyte,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dadyus,</td>
<td>daidhyaun,</td>
<td>ḍīdoīiev,</td>
<td>duīnt,</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>like 2d p.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dādiran,</td>
<td>daidita,</td>
<td>ḍīdoīnto</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 For dadyām, see §. 672
2 §. 442. Note 5, and §. 701.
3 §. 674.
4 §. 677.
5 §. 678.
6 I give only the third person singular and plural of the middle, and for the rest I refer the reader to the doctrine of middle terminations, §. 466. &c., and to the conjugation of adiya.
7 §. 703.
8 §. 701.
9 §. 462.
10 §. 702.
11 §. 678.
12 §. 613.
13 §. 703.

**SINGULAR.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>adyām, act.</td>
<td>adīya, mid.</td>
<td>edim 2</td>
<td>ēlyau, 3</td>
<td>āzi</td>
<td>......</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adyās, act.</td>
<td>adithās, mid.</td>
<td>edēs, 3</td>
<td>ēleis, 4</td>
<td>āzēs, 4</td>
<td>yaschdy, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adyāt, act.</td>
<td>adīta, mid.</td>
<td>edēt, 5</td>
<td>ēti, 6</td>
<td>āzi, 6</td>
<td>yaschdy, 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DUAL.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>adyāva, act.</td>
<td>adīvahī, mid.</td>
<td>ēleivn, 7</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>yaschdyva,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adyātam, act.</td>
<td>adīyāthām, mid.</td>
<td>ēleīts, 8</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>yaschdyta,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adyātām, act.</td>
<td>adīyātām, mid.</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>yaschdyta,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PLURAL.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>adyāma, act.</td>
<td>adīmahi, mid.</td>
<td>edīmus,</td>
<td>ēleima,</td>
<td>āzīmēs,</td>
<td>yaschdymy,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adyāta, act.</td>
<td>adūdhwam, mid.</td>
<td>edīitis,</td>
<td>ēleith,</td>
<td>āzūt,</td>
<td>yaschdyte,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adyus, act.</td>
<td>adīran, mid.</td>
<td>edint, 10</td>
<td>ēleina,</td>
<td>āzīn, 11</td>
<td>like 2d p.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 The middle of ad is not used in the present state of the language, which, however, does not prevent us from annexing it here on account of the theory. 2 §. 674. 3 §§. 675. 676. 4 §. 677.
FORMATION OF MOODS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SINGULAR</th>
<th>DUAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SANSKRIT.</strong></td>
<td><strong>ZEND.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dēyāsam,</td>
<td>dāyām,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dēyās,</td>
<td>dāyāv,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dēyāt,</td>
<td>dāyāt,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PLURAL.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>SANSKRIT.</strong></th>
<th><strong>ZEND.</strong></th>
<th><strong>GREEK.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>dēyāsma,</td>
<td>dāyāma,</td>
<td>dōihtev.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dēyāsta,</td>
<td>dāyāta,</td>
<td>dōihte.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dēyāsus,</td>
<td>dāyātin,</td>
<td>dōiien, dōihtav.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 For dāyāsam, see p. 934 G. ed.

I believe I am right in giving this form instead of the dyaïm mentioned at p. 934 G. ed.

3 § 703., conclusion.

4 For dāyāta, see § 701.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SINGULAR</th>
<th>DUAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SANSKRIT.</strong></td>
<td><strong>LITH.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dāsē-y-a,</td>
<td>. . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dāsē-shthās,</td>
<td>dūki.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dāsē-yhtha,</td>
<td>. . .</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PLURAL.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>SANSKRIT.</strong></th>
<th><strong>LITH.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>dāsī-mahi,</td>
<td>dūki-mc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dāsī-dhwam,</td>
<td>dūki-te.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dāsī-ran,</td>
<td>. . .</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 See §§ 679, 680, 2 § 540. p. 708 G. ed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sanskrit</th>
<th>Zend</th>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>Latin</th>
<th>Gothic</th>
<th>O. H. O.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>bhar-y-am</strong></td>
<td><strong>baroi</strong></td>
<td>(φεροι-ν)</td>
<td>feram</td>
<td>baira-u</td>
<td>bēre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>bhar-s</strong></td>
<td><strong>baroi-s</strong></td>
<td>φεροι-ς</td>
<td>fer-ς</td>
<td>bairai-s</td>
<td>bēre-s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>bhar-t</strong></td>
<td><strong>baroi-t</strong></td>
<td>φεροι-(τ)</td>
<td>fer-τ</td>
<td>bairai</td>
<td>bēre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>bhar-tu</strong></td>
<td><strong>bara-ta</strong></td>
<td>φεροι-το</td>
<td>fer-το</td>
<td>bairai-dun</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>bhar-va</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>bhar-tam</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>bhar-tam</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>bhar-va</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>bhar-tam</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>bhar-tam</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>bhar-va</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>bhar-tam</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>bhar-tam</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DUAL.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sanskrit</th>
<th>Zend</th>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>Latin</th>
<th>Gothic</th>
<th>O. H. O.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>bhar-ma</strong></td>
<td><strong>bara-ma</strong></td>
<td>φεροι-μευ</td>
<td>fer-mus</td>
<td>baira-ma</td>
<td>bēre-mēs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>bhar-ta</strong></td>
<td><strong>bara-ta</strong></td>
<td>φεροι-τε</td>
<td>fer-τις</td>
<td>bairai-th</td>
<td>bēre-t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>bhar-y-us</strong></td>
<td><strong>baray-ν</strong></td>
<td>φεροι-νε</td>
<td>fer-ντ</td>
<td>baira-νa</td>
<td>bēre-n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>bhar-ran</strong></td>
<td><strong>baray-ντο</strong></td>
<td>φεροι-ντο</td>
<td>fer-ντο</td>
<td>baira-νδαν</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>bhar-va</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>bhar-tam</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>bhar-tam</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>bhar-tam</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>bhar-va</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>bhar-tam</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>bhar-tam</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PLURAL.**

[946 POTENTIAL, OPTATIVE, AND SUBJUNCTIVE. [G. Ed. p. 974.] SINGULAR.]

**DUAL.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sanskrit</th>
<th>Zend</th>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>Latin</th>
<th>Gothic</th>
<th>O. H. O.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>bhar-ma</strong></td>
<td><strong>bara-ma</strong></td>
<td>φεροι-μευ</td>
<td>fer-mus</td>
<td>baira-ma</td>
<td>bēre-mēs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>bhar-ta</strong></td>
<td><strong>bara-ta</strong></td>
<td>φεροι-τε</td>
<td>fer-τις</td>
<td>bairai-th</td>
<td>bēre-t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>bhar-y-us</strong></td>
<td><strong>baray-ν</strong></td>
<td>φεροι-νε</td>
<td>fer-ντ</td>
<td>baira-νa</td>
<td>bēre-n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>bhar-ran</strong></td>
<td><strong>baray-ντο</strong></td>
<td>φεροι-ντο</td>
<td>fer-ντο</td>
<td>baira-νδαν</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>bhar-va</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>bhar-tam</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>bhar-tam</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>bhar-tam</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>bhar-va</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>bhar-tam</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>bhar-tam</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PLURAL.**

[946 POTENTIAL, OPTATIVE, AND SUBJUNCTIVE. [G. Ed. p. 974.] SINGULAR.]

**DUAL.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sanskrit</th>
<th>Zend</th>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>Latin</th>
<th>Gothic</th>
<th>O. H. O.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>bhar-ma</strong></td>
<td><strong>bara-ma</strong></td>
<td>φεροι-μευ</td>
<td>fer-mus</td>
<td>baira-ma</td>
<td>bēre-mēs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>bhar-ta</strong></td>
<td><strong>bara-ta</strong></td>
<td>φεροι-τε</td>
<td>fer-τις</td>
<td>bairai-th</td>
<td>bēre-t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>bhar-y-us</strong></td>
<td><strong>baray-ν</strong></td>
<td>φεροι-νε</td>
<td>fer-ντ</td>
<td>baira-νa</td>
<td>bēre-n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>bhar-ran</strong></td>
<td><strong>baray-ντο</strong></td>
<td>φεροι-ντο</td>
<td>fer-ντο</td>
<td>baira-νδαν</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>bhar-va</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>bhar-tam</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>bhar-tam</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>bhar-tam</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>bhar-va</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>bhar-tam</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>bhar-tam</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FORMATION OF MOODS.

SINGULAR. [G. Ed. p. 975.]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sanskrit</th>
<th>Zend</th>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>Latin</th>
<th>Goth</th>
<th>Old Sclav</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>vahé-y-am, 1 vazōi, 2 (ἔχοι-ν,) 3</td>
<td>vēham, 4</td>
<td>vēgi-s, 5</td>
<td>vēgi-s, 5</td>
<td>veζi. 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vahé-s, vazō-s, 7</td>
<td>vēhē-s, 4</td>
<td>vēhē-t, 6</td>
<td>vēhē-t, 6</td>
<td>veζi. 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vahé-t, vazō-t, 7</td>
<td>vēhē-t, 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vahé-ta, vazē-ta, ēχοio-to, 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DUAL.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sanskrit</th>
<th>Zend</th>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>Latin</th>
<th>Goth</th>
<th>Old Sclav</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>vahé-va, 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vahé-tam, 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vahé-tam, 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PLURAL.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sanskrit</th>
<th>Zend</th>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>Latin</th>
<th>Goth</th>
<th>Old Sclav</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>vahé-ma, vazē-ma, 9 ēχοio-me, 5</td>
<td>vēhē-mus, 4</td>
<td>vēhē-tis, 6</td>
<td>vēhē-tis, 6</td>
<td>veζye-te.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vahé-ta, vazē-ta, 9 ēχοio-te, 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vahé-y-nus, vazay-yn, ēχοio-cv, vēhe-nt, vēgai-na,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vahé-ran, vazay-anta, ἔχοio-vto,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 §§ 688, 689. 2 § 700. 3 § 689. 4 §§ 691, 692. 5 § 694. 6 § 694. conclusion. 7 § 699. 8 § 493. 9 § 706. 10 § 696. 11 § 696.

SINGULAR. PLURAL.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sanskrit</th>
<th>Latin</th>
<th>Sanskrit</th>
<th>Latin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>tishthe-y-am,</td>
<td>ste-m,</td>
<td>tishtē-ma, 5 ste-mus.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tishthe-s, 8</td>
<td>ste-s,</td>
<td>tishtē-ta, 5 ste-tis.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tishthe-t,</td>
<td>ste-t.</td>
<td>tishtē-y-us, 5 ste-nt.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The active of *smi*, "to laugh," which, by Guna, forms *smê-, and hence with *a* the class vowel, *smaya*, is not used in the present state of the language, and stands here only on account of the surprising resemblance between *smaydmi* and the Carniolan word of the same meaning, *smêyam* (see, however, N. 5), as also between the potential *smayêyam* and the Carniolan imperative *smêyay(m), &c.

1 I here express the Sanskrit diphthong ë, according to its etymological value, by at, in order to exhibit the more clearly the remarkable analogy of the Sanskrit potential to the Carniolan imperative (see §. 697.).

2 The diphthong at is expressed in Carniolan by ay. Regarding the loss of the personal terminations and the similarity of the three persons singular which proceeds from it, see §. 697.

3 Is expressed by a periphrasis formed of the present indicative with the particle nay.

4 Regarding the y preceding the termination o see §. 698.; but if the y of *smêyay-o* is connected with aya, the characteristic of the Sanskrit tenth class, as is usually the case in verbs in am, then *smêy-am* is properly based, not on *smayâmi* of the first class, but on *smâyayâmi* of the tenth; according to which *smi*, also, is inflected (also in the middle only), and *smêya-yo*

---

**POTENTIAL, OPTATIVE, AND SUBJUNCTIVE.**

[G. Ed p. 976.]

**SINGULAR.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>smaydi-mi</em></td>
<td><em>smêyâ-m</em></td>
<td><em>smayai-y-am</em></td>
<td><em>smêyay-(m)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>smaya-si</em></td>
<td><em>smêyâ-sh</em></td>
<td><em>smayai-s</em></td>
<td><em>smêyay-(s)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>smaya-ti</em></td>
<td><em>smêyâ-(t)</em></td>
<td><em>smayai-t</em></td>
<td><em>smêyay-(l)</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DUAL.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><em>smayd-vas</em></th>
<th><em>smêyâ-va</em></th>
<th><em>smayai-va</em></th>
<th><em>smêyay-va</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>smaya-thas</em></td>
<td><em>smêyâ-ta</em></td>
<td><em>smayai-tam</em></td>
<td><em>smêyay-ta</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>smaya-tas</em></td>
<td><em>smêyâ-ta</em></td>
<td><em>smayai-thm</em></td>
<td>. . . . .</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PLURAL.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><em>smayd-mas</em></th>
<th><em>smêyâ-mo</em></th>
<th><em>smayai-ma</em></th>
<th><em>smêyay-mo</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>smaya-tha</em></td>
<td><em>smêyâ-te</em></td>
<td><em>smayai-ta</em></td>
<td><em>smêyay-te</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>smaya-nti</em></td>
<td><em>smêyâ-yo</em></td>
<td><em>smayai-y-us</em></td>
<td>. . . . .</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5 *Regarding the y preceding the termination o see §. 698.; but if the y of smêyay-o is connected with aya, the characteristic of the Sanskrit tenth class, as is usually the case in verbs in am, then smêy-am is properly based, not on smayâmi of the first class, but on smâyayâmi of the tenth; according to which smi, also, is inflected (also in the middle only), and smêya-yo [G. Ed. p.977.] is therefore smâyayanti. But if this is really the case, as I believe it is, then for our present object—viz. in order to place in a clear light the analogy of the Carniolan imperative to the Sanskrit poten-
tial in a verb of kindred root, it would be better to contrast with the Carniolan smèyam the word smayámí, which is more similar to it than smdyayámì, though the affinity of the latter is greater. For the rest, the Carniolan in the third person plural present extends the termination yo, by an abuse, even to verbs to which the y does not properly belong; e.g. most verbs of Kopitar’s third example correspond to Dobrowsky’s third conjugation in Old Scavonian, and therefore to the Sanskrit first class. The third person plural, therefore, should not be griseyo but griso=Sanskrit gras-a-nti; and, in fact, many verbs of this class may, in the third person plural, employ o instead of eyo (Kopitar, p. 337); as nesò, “they carry” (for nèseyo or nesèyo)=Old Scavonian nesúty from nes-o-nty (see §. 255. g.) The y of forms like griseyo may also be regarded as an euphonic insertion to avoid a hiatus, as, in the Sanskrit, bhare-y-am, “I may carry” (§. 689.); but even with this explanation, which I prefer, griseyo, “they bite,” remains an inorganic form, since then the conjunctive vowel of the Sanskrit first class remains contained in it doubled, once as e, as in gris-e-te, “ye bite,”=gras-a-tha, and next as o, which, in Carniolan, appears as the termination of the third person plural, but ought properly only to be the supporter of the dropped termination, and which corresponds to the Greek o of λέγω-ντα, while the e of gris-e-te coincides with the Greek e of λέγω-Τη. In both languages the nasal of the termination, retained or dropped, exerts an influence on the coloring of the conjunctive vowel (see §. 255.g.). We must further notice here the Carniolan verb dàm, “I give,” since it is clear that in the third person plural dàyo (or dàyò) the y is a euphonic insertion, which is dropped in the more genuine dàdò (=Sanskrit dadati for dadantí, “they give”), since, in this word, the d prevents the meeting of the a and o, and thus the insertion of a foreign letter is rendered unnecessary. In das-te, “ye give,” das-ta, “ye two give,” “they two give,” we have forms exactly coinciding with the Sanskrit dat-tha, dat-thas, dat-tas (see §. 436.). With the form das-te, “ye give,” may be compared, in Zend, the form daś-ta, which perhaps does not occur, but may be safely conjectured to have existed (see §. 102.)

712. It remains to be remarked, with [G. Ed. p. 978.] respect to the Gothic subjunctive, that those weak verbs which have contracted the Sanskrit class character aya

* Grisem, “I bite,” is perhaps akin to the Sanskrit gras, to “devour”; therefore gris-e-m, gris-e-sh, =gras-å mi, gras-a-si.
to 6 ( = a + a) (see §. 109*. 6.), are incapable of formally denoting the modal relation, since i in Gothic does not combine with an 6 preceding it, but where 6i, would occur, the i is swallowed up by the 6; hence friyòs means both amas and ames, and, in the latter case, stands for friyòis;"* so in the plural friydth means both amatis and ametis. In the third person singular friyd, "amet" (for friydith) is only inorganically distinguished from friyòth, "amat" since the subjunctive, according to §. 432., has lost the personal character. The Old High German subjunctives like salbòs, salbòs, salbòs, are inorganic, since the 6 of salbòs, &c. (which is shortened in the Auslaut, terminating sound), is a contraction of ai (see §. 78.), of which the a must belong to the class character. But in the 6, therefore, which is equivalent to a + a, the whole of the primitive form अय aya is contained, except that the semi-vowel is rejected: there does not, therefore, remain any other a, which might, had it existed, have been contracted with the modal-vowel i to 6. Hence we must assume that the 6 has found its way into this class of verbs only through a mal-introduction from those verbs where it has a legitimate ground for entering, at a time when the language was no longer conscious that the last half of the 6=ai belongs to the modal designation, but

[G. Ed. p. 979.] the former half to the derivation. Such is the case, for example, with forms like hablès, "habees," habéémès, "habeamus," in which the first 6 contains the two first elements of the class-syllable अय aya (which are alone represented in the indicative hab-é-m, hab-é-s, see

* I am not of opinion that in the indicative, also, we should derive salbòs from salbòs, and, in the first person, salbò from salbòa; for as in vig-a’, vig-i-s, vig-i-th (see §. 507., Table), the a and i belong, not to the personal sign, but to the derivative or class-syllable, so in salb-δ’, salb-δ-s, salb-θ-th, the δ only represents the a of the strong conjugation, which is interchanged with i: the personal terminations, however, are as complete as in the strong conjugation.
p. 121 G. ed.); but the second ε contains the last a in contraction with the modal vowel i; so that, therefore, in varmanēs the second ε coincides with the Sanskrit ē of mānayeś and the Latin ā of moneēs (from moneais, see §. 691.), and the first ē with the Latin e and Sanskrit ay, which we have seen above (p. 121 G. ed.) also, in the Prākrit mānēmi, contracted to ē. The Gothic does not admit the diphthong ai twice together uninterruptedly; hence, habais, "habēs," stands in disadvantageous contrast with the Old High German hābēs, and is not distinguishable from its indicative.

713. The Vēda-dialect possesses a mood which is wanting in the classic Sanskrit, and which occurs in the Vēdas even only in a few scanty remnants: it is called, by the Indian Grammarians, Lēt, and is rightly identified by Lassen with the Greek subjunctive. For as λέγ-ω-μεν, λέγ-η-τε, λέγ-ω-μαι, λέγ-η-ται, λέγ-ω-νται, are distinguished from the corresponding indicative forms λέγ-ο-μεν, λέγ-ε-τε, λέγ-ο-μαι, λέγ-ε-ται, λέγ-ο-νται, only by the lengthening of the vowel of the class-syllable, so, in the Vēda-dialect, pat-ā-ti, "cadat," is in like manner distinguished from pat-a-ti, "cadit"; grihyā-nt-āi, "capiantur," from grih-ya-ntē, "capiuntur"; only that in the latter form the tendency of the mood under discussion to the utmost possible fulness of form is manifested in this also, that the final diphthong ē (=ai) is augmented to di, in agreement with the first person imperative, which in general accords more with the mood Lēt than with the other persons of the imperative, since the person of the imperative which corresponds to the first person plural middle bibhrimahē, "we carry," is bibhardamahāi.

714. In Greek, neither the subjunctive nor [G. Ed. p. 980.] any other mood is derived from the imperfect, but in Vēdic Sanskrit the mood Lēt comes from it; as also in Zend, which uses this mood very commonly, and, indeed, principally in the imperfect tense, but with the meaning of the
subjunctive present; as, char-ā-t, "eat," fromḥṛṣṭuḥ char-ā-t, "ibat"; van-ā-t, "destruat," from ṭmṛṣṭu van-ā-t, "destruebat"; ṭrṣṭuḥ pat-an-ū, "volent" (for ṭt-ā-n, see §.702.), ṭrṣṭuḥ bar-an-ū, "ferant," from ṭt-ē-n, bar-ē-ṇ, or rather from their primitive forms ṭt-an-ū, bar-a-n. Thus in the Vēda-dialect, ṭt-an-m, "cadam," from ṭpat-an-m, "cadebam"; prachād-ya-t, "incitet," from prāchād-ya-t, "incitabat."

715. I am of opinion that the Sanskrit potential and precative, and the moods in the kindred languages which may be classed with them, are connected with the principle of formation of the Lēt, or Greek subjunctive, in so far as the auxiliary verb contained therein, which these moods share with the future (see §.670.), has a long ā as the conjunctive vowel, while the future has a short a. Consequently the Sanskrit dad-yāt and dē-yāt, the Zend ḍvīdh-yaṭ and ḍā-yaṭ, the Greek ḍiō-ῖn and ḍo-ῖn, would properly signify, "he may please to give," and thus this mood would be only a more polite form of the Lēt, or subjunctive, like the German expression, "Ich bitte, mir dies gestatten zu wollen," "I pray you to be willing to allow me this," is more polite than the abrupt "mir dies zu gestatten," "to allow me this." On the other hand, the future ḍā-s-yaṭi signifies "he will give," or, literally, "he will be giving;" and the "willing" is here not an expression of politeness, but the symbol of the time not being the present; or it denies the present in a less decided manner than is the case in the augmented preterites by the a of negation.